The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 1922 NUMBER 382

Contents

The Week 119

Editorials

Coal: A Public Utility..... 121
American Diplomacy and the Secret Treaties... 122
Gandhi and the Crisis in India..... 124
A Lawless Department of Justice..... 126

General Articles

Evading the Coal Question.....Leo Wolman 128
Contagious Poverty.....Pierre Hamp 130
He Walks with His Chin in the Air (Verse).. .....Hazel Hall 132
Prison—and the American Scene..... .....Charles Ashleigh 132
The Plight of the English Tories..... .....An English Liberal 134
Yourself and Your Critics.....Stark Young 137
Self-Portrait (Verse).....Elinor Wylie 138

A Communication.....James R. Angell 139

Correspondence 139

Reviews of Books

Landlubbers on Foreign Seas..Charles A. Beard 144
Jack London.....Lewis Mumford 145
Five Novels.....Herbert S. Gorman 147
Psychiatrists to the Rescue.....H. M. Kallen 148
Mr. Benchley's Message to His Age..... .....Edmund Wilson, Jr. 149

The Week

RECOGNITION of the Mexican government is again reported to be pending. It would appear to be time for that issue to be settled. In the last twelve months there has been no real American interest subserved by the policy of non-recognition. Obregon has succeeded beyond all expectations in maintaining an orderly government. American commerce with Mexico has revived, and Americans engaged in business in Mexico have found protection and prosperity. If it were in the power of the American government to bring about the fall of Obregon would it do so? Certainly not. There is no Mexican faction to supplant him which would be so favorable to American interests. Non-recognition, however, is a menace to Obregon, and in any crisis which may arise in the future may prove decisive against him. It is a policy involving risks and no corresponding gains. We do not know why Mr. Hughes has persisted in the policy, except perhaps from a passion for consistency which is not very serviceable in the shifting current of international affairs.

BRITISH financial experts have proposed a new plan for disposing of the inter-Allied debts and the German reparations. For every billion of inter-Allied debt remitted, cut the German reparations down by a billion. The sum of reparations, after deduction of values paid in kind, lies somewhere between 100,000,000,000 and 120,000,000,000 gold marks. The inter-Allied debts amount to 65,000,000,000 gold marks. Cancel the latter and cut the German indemnity to between 35,000,000,000 and 55,000,000,000 gold marks, and the international financial situation, the British experts say, would be greatly simplified. So it would, no doubt. And yet it is very unlikely that Americans, for all their fondness for simplicity—and for all the simplicity imputed to them—will be enthusiastic about the plan.

IT is well known to Americans that the greater part of the thirty-two billion dollar indemnity imposed upon Germany is simply a bad debt. We doubt very much that more than a minority in America are yet ready to admit that it is morally a bad debt. They are not ignorant of the fact that a binding international agreement was violated when the reparations bill was inflated by the addition of pensions and separation allowances. But there is enough war feeling left to condone crooked dealings of which Germany was the victim. There is no such astigmatism in the American view of the financial value of the reparations claim. If the Series C reparations bonds were offered on the American exchanges, they would not command two cents on the dollar. They are nothing but water. And it is this bogus asset the British experts urge us to set off dollar for dollar against our claims on England, France and Italy. They regard us, apparently, as very young and innocent. We may be, but not so young and innocent as to be unable to distinguish between solid values and dirty water.

ACCORDING to Lenin, Russian communism has completed its "strategic retreat." It will recede

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no farther. It may be worth while, then, to survey the territory it has abandoned to the enemy, capitalism. Private interest is virtually admitted throughout the field of agricultural production. The peasant will hold his field without molestation, and after the payment of taxes in kind, will sell his products as he pleases. Foreign capital will be permitted to operate forests, mines and factories under concessions running for a stipulated period of time, and will, presumably, be permitted to sell products in Russia or export them. The concession to Haywood indicates that in some cases enterprises not dependent on foreign support will be permitted to sell part of their product. Foreign trade, however, remains nationalized, or at least subject to strict national control. Whether any foreign capital will be attracted to Russia under these conditions we do not know. The French will stay out of Russia, and do their best to keep the Germans out, unless the Soviet government promises to pay all the old Russian debt, as well as French claims on account of private interests. The British and Italians will probably go in if the next season produces a surplus of grain, as the character of the last winter makes rather probable.

THE Conference on Immigration Policy, recently held in New York, has proposed a number of modifications of the three percent quota law which are so reasonable that there ought to be no question of their enactment. One would limit passport visas to the quota number from each country; another would permit naturalized citizens, or aliens who have been resident here for three years and have declared their intention to become citizens, to bring in their wives, children under sixteen, parents over fifty-five and fiancées whether the quota is filled or not; a third would fix the minimum quota at 1,200; a fourth would treat the nationality of children as that of their parents, and the nationality of a wife as that of her husband; a fifth would force steamship companies knowingly bringing immigrants in excess of the quota to refund passage money; a sixth would provide for the refunding of passport fees. None of these proposals would weaken the immigration act, in principle. Every one of them would eliminate sources of grave hardship to immigrants and their kinsmen domiciled here.

GROUPS of women in Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, Virginia and Alabama, formed for the purpose of promoting race cooperation in the South, have recently assembled and passed a remarkably courageous and significant set of resolutions about one aspect of the Negro question. Recognizing that where there is weakness and failure of public officials in the execution of the law, it is usually due to the "weakness of public sentiment on moral issues" they appeal to "all good citizens to recognize the forces which are undermining our life and speedily to banish self-constituted agencies which usurp authority and constitute themselves the prosecutors, jurors, judges and executors of suspected criminals." They "feel a deep sense of appreciation for the chivalry of men who would give their lives for the purity and safety of the women of their own race" yet "they find in their hearts no extenuation for crime, be it violators of womanhood, mob violence or illegal taking of life" and they "believe that no falser appeal can be made to southern manhood than that mob violence is necessary for the protection of womanhood or that the brutal practice of lynching and burning human beings is an expression of chivalry." They associate by implication the practice of lynching with another practice which the ordinary man regards as one of his most precious privileges. "The double standard of morals," these Southern women declare, "is rapidly producing results which imperil the future integrity of our national life." They "are persuaded that this problem can never be solved as long as there is a double standard for women of any race." "They wish to bring about a state of public opinion which will compel the protection of the purity of both races."

A SERIES of petitions, placed before the Senate by Mr. Lodge, from the Massachusetts Federation of Churches, gives an interesting picture of what things in this world the churches chiefly care to have accomplished, or to prevent. One petition urges the passage of the Dyer anti-lynching bill, others the passage of bills regulating immigration, excluding lottery paraphernalia from the mails, prohibiting the importation of opium, and regulating interstate commerce in immoral motion picture films. The two remaining petitions pray for the remission of Austria's debt for twenty years, and for immediate relief of the people of Armenia. If we are to take this program as a picture of what some of the churches want to do to better the world, it makes a rather miscellaneous pattern: anti-lynching, Austria, opium, Armenia, movies, lotteries, immigration. One feels tempted to inquire how these subjects rank in the minds of the church beside others which some hold to be of importance—the Russian famine for instance, or the German debt, or the French army, or birth-control, education, the twelve-hour day, unemployment?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Coal: A Public Utility

COAL is a public utility, in the same sense that transportation is a public utility. It was not so defined, to be sure, in the creative period of English legal evolution, when the public character of the service of common carriers became established. In those days people burned wood, and trees grew everywhere. The common carrier was given a special status and subjected to special regulations for the excellent reason that, if left to his own devices, he had it in his power to take everyone else by the throat. That is exactly the position of the coal industry today. Every other industry depends on it, if not directly as a source of power, at least indirectly as indispensable to railway transportation. Every city dweller depends on it for heat and light and street railway service. If there is any good reason why the public authorities should take a hand in the control of transportation, there is as good or even a better reason why they should take a hand in the control of coal. This everyone recognizes at times like the present when a great coal strike impends and we are threatened by a fuel famine. Everyone is ready to go at least so far as to force a settlement by means that would not be regarded as appropriate to textiles, the clothing industry, shoe manufacturing or other industries that remain essentially private.

A threatened strike concentrates public interest on the industry and reveals its essential character. But the major problems of the industry in its relation to the public are always with us. It is important that the operators and the miners should come to some sort of agreement that permits the industry to function. It is still more important that in normal times the industry should function with efficiency and economy. Whether we are liberally supplied with the manufactured products we need depends on the price of coal. Cheap coal or dear determines our international competitive position. No effort lavished upon building up a merchant marine will secure our position in the international competitive field unless our goods can come to the ports stripped of excessive fuel costs.

It goes without saying that we have to pay for coal the cost of mining it, and that the cost must be reckoned in the terms usual with private industry. The mine workers must have fair wages and the operators must have fair profits. The industry is affected with a public interest, but the property and labor employed in it remain private, possessed of the usual private rights. The enjoyment of those rights is, however, properly subject to one condition: that the industry must be conducted with the maximum practicable efficiency. The industry has a right to a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. Does it give the fair day's work? No.

According to the United States Geological Survey, the soft coal miners averaged something more than three days' work a week in 1921. In the last thirty years they have lost on the average ninety-three working days in the year or thirty percent of their possible working time. We have been maintaining, then, in some fashion, thirty percent more miners than our fuel requirements demanded.

According to the statements of the operators two-thirds of the mine cost of coal consists of miners' wages. Then twenty percent of the cost would have to be placed under the head of surplus labor maintained in the mining communities. There is another item in unnecessary costs which it is impossible to evaluate definitely. That is the depreciation of unused mine equipment, and interest on the capital invested in it. The two items together must mount up to one-quarter or more of the mine cost of the coal.

Almost all the coal must be loaded on cars and shipped considerable distances before it reaches the consumer. And everyone knows that the irregularity of operations at the mines keeps thousands of coal cars standing on side-tracks eating up interest and maintenance charges. What this item amounts to nobody can say.

Nor can anyone say how far excessive profits prevail in the mining and the handling of coal. We know that in some cases, at any rate, profits have been exceedingly high. We know that in other cases excessive royalties have been paid. According to the testimony of Mr. A. B. Jessup before the sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, the royalties of the Girard estate on some three million tons of anthracite rose with the price of coal, and have gone up to $1.00, $1.25, and in the case of one company to $1.33 a ton. That is the tribute of the householder to the principle of absentee landlordism. How general this abuse is, however, nobody knows.

Some profiteering in coal there certainly is. How much there is nobody knows. There is a vast deal of inefficiency, but here again nobody can say just how much. Nobody knows what the coal miner of average efficiency is actually making, or what it really costs him to live. Ask almost any serious question you wish about the industry,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the one truthful reply will be, nobody knows.

Nevertheless, coal is a public utility, and the American people have a right to all the facts. They must have the facts if they are to act, and they must act, unless we are as a nation to be cramped in supplying our domestic needs and handicapped in all our international competitive relations. Why have we not the facts, then?

Because the coal operators will not let us have them. They say that the public labors under a delusion in its belief that there is profiteering in the industry. They say that the major part of the industry is more familiar with losses than with profits. They say that the waste involved in keeping five men to do the work of four is due to causes beyond their control. Perhaps that is true. But if it is, why do they fight so desperately to prevent any competent public inquiry into the facts? The Federal Trade Commission has been enjoined from pursuing its inquiry into profits. But why do not the operators' associations waive their rights to secrecy and offer free access to their books? If they have nothing to hide, why do they act as if they had everything to hide?

For our own part we do not believe that profiteering is the problem of chief importance in the industry. Incompetence is, we think, the greater problem. We do not believe that the incompetence can properly be imputed mainly to the individual operator. It is the whole system of coal supply that is at fault. And what we need immediately is not a scheme of price fixing nor the prosecution of technically unlawful combinations in the industry, but an entirely new orientation, the recognition of the position of coal as a public utility.

As a public utility we ought to have an official engineering survey of the national requirements and of the whole system of supplying those requirements, from the mine to the consumer. We ought to know the costs and profits at every stage in the process. And when we know this we ought to call upon the engineers of the country to find us a plan of operation by which both the costs and the profits can be cut back to a reasonable minimum. Must we nationalize the mines to arrive at the object desired, or can we get on with a system of regulated private property in coal lands? Must we seek to restore competition, or encourage the formation of greater and more responsible operating units? We can not know until we get the facts. But the facts we must have. And we can get them when once we recognize that anarchy in coal supply is no satisfactory basis for an orderly industrial state.

American Diplomacy and the Secret Treaties

THE letter of Mr. Walter Lippmann's published on another page of this issue calls renewed attention to a disagreeable business which demands honest and careful consideration. Apropos of Mr. Ray Stannard Baker's article on ex-President Wilson's acquaintance with the secret treaties before his arrival in Paris, which appeared in the New York Times of February 28th, Mr. Lippmann asserts of his own personal knowledge that documents relating to them passed through Colonel House's hands previous to the drafting of the Fourteen Points at the end of December, 1917, that certain of these points are unintelligible without reference to the treaties and that Secretary Lansing knew the details of the Pacific Treaty in the spring of 1918. The assertions of Mr. Lippmann are not of course absolutely conclusive as to President Wilson's familiarity with the treaties; but together with the evidence assembled by Mr. Baker himself they build up a presumption in favor of such familiarity so strong that it amounts almost to a demonstration.

Take the facts as they are assembled and in part disclosed by Mr. Baker. He asserts that when Mr. Balfour came to Washington as the British Commissioner in April 1917 he explained certain of these treaties to Colonel House. Colonel House however said "he was not particularly interested because it seemed more important to bend all our energies to winning the war." Mr. Balfour, so far as Mr. Baker knows, did not reopen the subject with the American government, "while Colonel House apparently let it drop without reference to the President." The American government, according to Mr. Baker's account, remained in this condition of suspended knowledge or ignorance of the secret treaties until the end of the war. In the meantime the Soviet government published the text of most of these documents on November 17, 1917, and a little later the Manchester Guardian and the New York Evening Post, an English translation. The effect of this indiscreet disclosure was widespread and immediate. The Allied governments which had followed Colonel House's example and directed all their energies to "winning the war" in spite of the secret treaties found themselves in danger of losing it on account of the secret treaties. The printing of such disconcerting agreements produced, according to Mr. Baker, "an ill effect upon the already restive groups of the opposition in allied countries," "suspicion and doubt in America" and "more war spirit in Germany." The tension became so dangerous that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Lloyd George "immediately began to try to satisfy labor—and America—with a more advanced and idealistic statement of war aims," and this he did by his speech before the Trades Union Congress on January 5, 1918. It was followed a few days later by ex-President Wilson's address in which he elaborated the Fourteen Points.

So the matter rested until the armistice, which, of course, embodied the Fourteen Points in its provisions. Subsequently during the Paris negotiations Mr. Wilson found himself blocked by these secret agreements which the representatives of France, Great Britain and Italy used consistently as the point of departure for their policy. The Treaty of Versailles, as it finally emerged, was moulded far more by these agreements than it was by the Fourteen Points. They were the most important weapon of Mr. Wilson's opponents and the immediate cause of his failure. After the failure became apparent his disappointed supporters in this country began to question the means which he had taken to realize the American war aims. They asked why he had not negotiated with the Allies and obtained from them, while they still needed American military assistance, at least a partial repudiation of the secret treaties. Some such question was implied when Senator Borah inquired of Mr. Wilson on August 19, 1919, the approximate date of his first knowledge of the treaties:

> SENATOR BORAH—. . . . When did the secret treaties between Great Britain, France and the other nations of Europe with reference to certain adjustments in Europe first come to your knowledge? Was that after you reached Paris also?
>
> THE PRESIDENT—Yes, the whole series of understandings were disclosed to me for the first time then.
>
> SENATOR BORAH—Then we had no knowledge of these secret treaties, so far as our Government was concerned, until you reached Paris?
>
> THE PRESIDENT—*Not unless there was information* at the State Department of which I knew nothing.

In this colloquy Mr. Wilson disclaims any knowledge of the secret treaties until he began negotiations in Paris, and the editor of his papers, Mr. Baker, comments upon this disclaimer in the following words: "This does not mean, of course, that the President did not know of the practice in general of the old diplomacy both by Germany and the Allies. He refers again and again, in his speeches during 1918 particularly, to the practice of making private and secret arrangements, though the numerous references in his speeches to 'secret diplomacy' probably bear upon the system of secret alliances existing before the war rather than to the more recent arrangements. He never, until he reached Paris, enough appreciated the critical importance of these old entanglements to impel him to *make a study of them or really to know about them*" (italics ours). "It is easy," he adds, "after the event to excoriate this American ignorance and the failure to pay any attention to such vital matters. It is indeed inexcusable and yet there are mitigating circumstances. America has never had a thoroughly trained well-paid professional diplomatic service"—and so on.

In our opinion Mr. Baker's own account of the disclosure during the war of the contents of the secret treaties makes it incredible that Mr. Wilson was not acquainted with their contents, while his comments on Mr. Wilson's disclaimer and his explanation of the "inexcusable ignorance" of the presidential diplomacy exhibit a discouraging and deplorable lack of candor.

Consider some of the discrepancies in the narrative which Mr. Baker gives as a faithful and adequate account of Mr. Wilson's relation to the secret treaties. The President in April, 1917, obtains from Congress a declaration of war against Germany after delivering a speech in which he identified the cause for which he asked his fellow countrymen to fight with the condemnation of imperialism and the loftiest democratic and international ideals. A British mission comes to this country to arrange for political and military cooperation. Its chief communicates to the President's adviser on foreign affairs information about the existence and the terms of certain contracts among the previous enemies of Germany whose execution would transfigure President Wilson's war to safeguard democracy into a war for territory without regard to the preferences of its inhabitants and for future military and political preponderance in Europe. Mr. Wilson's adviser "apparently let it drop without reference to the President" because "it seemed to him more important to bend all energies to the winning of the war." If this is true Colonel House was utterly unfit to act as the President's adviser about foreign affairs; and as we know how well fitted he was, how scrupulously faithful he was to the President and how he himself detested the politicts of the secret treaties, we simply do not believe that he allowed the President to remain in ignorance of such vital facts. If he had failed to impart this information to Mr. Wilson, he would have betrayed the confidence of his friend and chief.

Later the treaties were published. Their publication caused active and dangerous discontent in British labor. The British Prime Minister had to devote some of the energy which he was spending on winning the war to the revision of the aims for which the Allied and associated powers were fighting. His speech of January 5, 1918, was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intended to counteract the loss of morale which the publication of the secret treaties had brought about. The declaration of the Fourteen Points by Mr. Wilson followed, the purpose of which was the same as that of the British Premier's speech. The formulation of American war aims is inexplicable except as an attempt to substitute a public non-imperialist contract between the Allied governments and their peoples for the private imperialist contracts of the secret treaties. Mr. Lippmann's letter now confirms this obvious interpretation. It is true that his testimony concerns Colonel House rather than the President, but Colonel House was the head of an organization whose only purpose was to prepare material bearing on the diplomacy of war and peace for the President's use. This organization furnished to the President a digest of treaties to be used presumably in preparing an anticipated address—the one which subsequently embodied the Fourteen Points. Several of the points are "unintelligible" without reference to the information furnished at the critical moment to President Wilson through Colonel House. It is utterly incredible that Colonel House did not communicate the "documents" to the President and that the President did not use them in preparing his speech.

Finally, in the light of his own disclosures and the contents of Mr. Lippmann's letter which Mr. Baker knows, what are we to think of Mr. Baker's comments on the cause of this diplomatic misadventure? He attributes it to an "ignorance" which he characterizes as "inexcusable" but whose inexcusability is mitigated by the lack of a skilled American diplomatic service. Yet, according to his own account, this explanation bears no relation to the facts. The British government had communicated the information to the President's confidential adviser on foreign affairs, and if it failed to reach the President the failure was not due to incompetence. Furthermore the President himself in the fall of 1917 arranged through Colonel House for the establishment of a bureau which was designed to collect the necessary information and supply the American government with an adequate diplomatic "intelligence service." This bureau was fully cognizant of the secret treaties, which had already become common knowledge. It placed all the available information at Mr. Wilson's disposal. If mistakes were committed by the American government in its handling of the diplomatic business of the country during and after the war, they were not the result of ignorance. When he falls back on this explanation, Mr. Baker is disingenuous to an extent which, under the circumstances, amounts to the misinforming of his readers.

Gandhi and the Crisis in India

THE comment most generally made by Indian Nationalists on the arrest of M. K. Gandhi seems to be this: that the method of Non-cooperation has now been given a fair trial; that the British government refuses to allow its continuance, and that, as a consequence, the Indian people are now forced to take the road of violent resistance. The substantive statement, it appears to us, and the inference, are alike illusory. Less than three years have passed since Mr. Gandhi, his dwindling faith in England shattered by the guns of Brigadier-General Dyer at Amritsar, announced the full program of Non-cooperation. The notion that, among the myriads of India, a program such as that could be given an adequate trial in so brief a time is surely absurd. And those Indians, who, now that Mr. Gandhi is in jail, find themselves tempted to repudiate his doctrine, should give heed to their leader's warning. He has said repeatedly that if Non-cooperation turns to violence India will never attain her freedom. The present in India is extraordinarily dark and confused. But about the immediate future one thing seems to be beyond question. The Indian Nationalists, having been carried thus far by the power of an idea, embodied in a unique personality, will win or lose in this conflict with the government of India, according as they prove themselves able or not to persevere in the application of the Gandhi doctrine.

The extraordinary movement which assumed its present shape in the early months of 1919 has two sides: first, the crusade for a free, though not necessarily an independent, India—of which crusade Mr. Gandhi became the unchallenged leader through the conditions that developed in the last year of the war; and secondly, the Mahomedan agitation for the revision of the Turkish treaty and for the restoration of the Khilafat—that is, of the spiritual headship of Islam in the person of the Turkish Sultan at Constantinople. Mr. Gandhi, by reason mainly of his championship of the rights of Indian settlers in South Africa, is the first and only Indian leader to command a great following in both the Hindu and Moslem communities. When the treaty of Sèvres was framed in 1920, he entered into an alliance with the Mahomedan leaders, declaring that the Khilafat was no less essentially an Indian cause than the cause of Swaraj (own rule) itself. At any moment after last summer Mr. Gandhi's specific and reiterated challenge to authority was liable to be taken up by the head of the Indian government. But the Viceroy held his hand, with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

approval of Mr. Montagu, the liberal Secretary of State; and as matters befell, it was not over Mr. Gandhi but over the Turkish treaty that Mr. Montagu came to grief and Lord Reading found himself in danger of recall.

There has never been any doubt as to the united stand of the Viceroy in India and the Secretary of State in London on behalf of the fairest possible treatment for Turkey. They agreed in the main with the position taken up by the Indian Moslems, and against the Allied governments they could quote the definite pledges of the British Prime Minister, as to the future of Constantinople and the Turkish homelands, given within a few days of the Wilsonian Fourteen Points. After going to India Lord Reading made no attempt to hide his own strong view. Some months ago he informed the Moslems that the government of India was using its weight with the imperial government in favor of treaty revision. He knew that the case had become desperately urgent, especially after his government had secured the arrest and conviction of the principal Moslem agitators and also after Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Curzon, yielding to the force of circumstances in another part of the Islamic world, had been compelled to proclaim the freedom of Egypt. Hence Lord Reading's insistence on the necessity of making public the Indian government's proposals for a new settlement with Turkey—an insistence that led to his colleague's undoing, and has since borne fruit in the new offer to the Turkish government at Angora.

So much for England and Turkey. But what of the apostle of Non-cooperation and the crisis into which the government of India is plunged by his arrest and condemnation? Mr. Gandhi, true to his principle, calls once again upon his adherents to refrain from violence of every kind and to go forward during his imprisonment with the positive work of Non-cooperation. He forbids the organization of a hartal, or protest strike—doubtless being convinced that, with himself not on the spot to direct the strike, or to call it off at the exact strategic moment, an outbreak of mob hysteria would be inevitable. In this connection it is worth while to recall the resolutions adopted at the annual session of the Indian National Congress three months ago. They were singularly fine and impressive in expression, an astonishing contrast to the flatulence and insincerity of the motions familiar to political conventions in the West. They reaffirmed the program of "non-violent non-cooperation," to be prosecuted by all peaceful and legitimate means, to the end that the control of the government may speedily pass into the hands of the Indian people. (It is significant that no reference is made to independence or to an Indian republic.) They call upon non-cooperators everywhere to enroll themselves in the volunteer bodies, thereby practically offering themselves for arrest. They repeat the pledge of the Non-cooperation volunteers: of entire abstention from violence; acceptance of belief in the unity of India; complete removal of the ban of untouchability from the outcaste communities; fidelity to the vow of Swadeshi—that is, the use of "hand-spun and hand-woven khaddar, to the exclusion of every other cloth"; and readiness to suffer, without resentment, imprisonment, assault, or death for the sake of religion and country.

There is no need to explain that these resolutions—which were coupled with the bestowal of immense, though strictly guarded, powers upon Mr. Gandhi—are the expression of the leader's own mind and spirit. The National Congress confirmed them by large majorities, but only after the assertion by Mr. Gandhi of his personal authority. Representatives of the extremist section moved to substitute the phrase "all possible means" for "peaceful and legitimate means"—which would, of course, have had the effect of transforming or destroying the entire movement. Nor was this attempted amendment the only sign of an anti-Gandhi reaction, for, while the National Congress was in session, the All-India Moslem League was engaged in debating a proposition that the non-violence principle should be eliminated from the platform. This was calculated to bring grief to Mr. Gandhi, who is incapable of compromising on his central principle. But it cannot have been a surprise to him, since at the trial of several Mahomedan leaders, last fall, more than one of the accused had reasserted in the plainest terms the unchanging Moslem belief in the right of the sword.

The evidence, then, would seem to be irresistible. The Non-cooperation movement as a whole has been held to the principle of non-violence by the single power of Mr. Gandhi, who has now been put out of the way under a sentence of six years. It is not inconceivable that many of his followers, especially among the peasantry and the literate classes, may make a stand for the preservation of non-violence. But the government of India has proscribed the Non-cooperation volunteers as a seditious and revolutionary body. Force is being applied to their disbandment. That is to say, they are being subjected to a form of provocation which crusaders organized in contingents have never been known to suffer without resistance. There are, moreover, very large and varied divisions of the Indian people to whom the ideas of non-violence and passive resistance are altogether

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreign. The Moslem reliance upon force is proverbial. Not a few of the Hindu races are as militant as any in the world. The Sikhs of the Punjab were created and have been preserved as a martial community; and they are by tradition anti-Mahomedan. The Moplahs of the south, in rebellion since last summer, earned a grave rebuke from Mr. Gandhi for their conduct towards their Hindu neighbors. These and many other indications imply only too clearly that the next stage in India cannot fail to be one of conflict and disorder, and also of the hardest trial for British statesmanship.

Lord Reading has succeeded in retaining his office, and, even in the event of Lloyd George's retirement, it will manifestly be the purpose of the imperial government to avoid a change in the Viceroyalty. But what then? England may, and undoubtedly will, strike hard at the tremendous movement which, as its leader confesses with his stupefying simplicity and candor, is designed to overthrow the alien government. But England cannot enter upon the subjugation of India. Ireland and Egypt are overpowering witnesses to the contrary. The age of conquest is past. Humanity is on the march. There seems no escape from the conclusion that the choice before the nations now dominant in the world is terrible but clear. It is the choice between a futile, and in the end fatal, attempt to check by force the drive of the peoples, and a daring resolution to throw open the gates and lead them into freedom.

A Lawless Department of Justice

ON December 10, 1921, the Senate authorized the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the charges of illegal practices which a committee of lawyers appointed by the National Popular Government League and headed by Dean Roscoe Pound of the Harvard Law School had directed against the Department of Justice. The investigation was conducted by a sub-committee with Senator Walsh of Montana as its chairman. As Senator Walsh is a Democrat and an intelligent and loyal supporter of the former Wilson administration, the personnel of the sub-committee left no opportunity for the opponents of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Palmer to use its report as a weapon of partisan warfare. The sub-committee has occupied a year in taking and digesting testimony and its report is now published. It is practically a complete justification of the charges. The raids against the "reds" which the Department of Justice and the Department of Labor conducted between November, 1919, and January, 1920, are condemned as examples of inexcusably illegal violence.

During these raids about 10,000 men were arrested. The arrests were made on the legal pretext of some 6,350 warrants issued by the Department of Labor against individual aliens who were alleged to cherish illegal beliefs, to be residing here in violation of the law and to be liable to deportation. Of the 10,000 arrested some 3,000 were identified as persons named in the warrants and were imprisoned. At the writing of the report the Department of Labor had ordered the deportation of 762; had cancelled 1,293 warrants and was still considering the disposition of some 1,000 cases. In relation to these raids the report of the sub-committee states as "indisputable" the following propositions:

1. The agents of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice have no authority to make arrests in deportation proceedings, if, indeed, they have authority to make arrests at all.
2. The agents of the Department of Labor have no authority to make an arrest looking to deportation without a warrant.
3. The issuance of a warrant upon the unsworn statement of an agent of the Bureau of Investigation is a plain violation of the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.
4. There is no authority in the law for the conduct of a search in deportation proceedings, either of the residence of the alien or in the meeting place of societies condemned by the immigration laws or for the seizure of books, records, or papers of either.
5. There is no authority in the law for the issuance of a search warrant in deportation proceedings at all.
6. There is no authority in the law for the issuance of a search warrant to seize books or papers to be used as evidence, even of the commission of a crime, much less to establish a case in deportation proceedings.

The participation of the Department of Justice in the deportation proceedings is characterized as "deliberate usurpation." The searches and seizures were "the lawless acts of a mob." Again and again the report criticizes the barbarous inhumanity, the disregard of the most elementary sense of decency and legality with which the raids were conducted.

The report not only unsparingly condemns the lawlessness and violence of that Department of the government which above all others should most scrupulously respect the law, but it criticizes the policy of proscribing indiscriminately all the members of an alleged illegal organization. "The great majority of those arrested, yea, even of those ordered deported," Senator Walsh declares, "were perfectly harmless, deluded individuals, many of them unable to speak a word of English,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with little comprehension of the principles or the purpose of the political party of which upon one consideration or another they had become nominal members." The report contains the following quotation from a lawyer who reviewed the record in some of the Detroit cases:

> The evidence in these cases tends to show a technical membership in a Communist Party organization, but utterly fails to show the character of the membership. No attention is given to the social, racial, and educational factors involved, and no attempt is made to determine whether the man is a member of a certain organization simply because of the restaurant facilities and the classes in reading and writing, or because he is interested in the political doctrines which it represents. It does not appear that the men are at all cognizant of the political doctrines of the organization.

Many of those arrested were house holders and not a few had accumulated considerable property. Many more were fathers of families with children born in America. Others had enviable war records and had served loyally in the army.

The report not only "unhesitatingly condemns the making simultaneously of thousands of arrests, including many persons who by no stretch of the statute were amenable to deportation" but it questions "the policy of a rigid enforcement of the law against every individual ascertained to be a member of one of the proscribed parties." "It has usually been considered wise," Senator Walsh points out, "in the case of riot and other outbreaks of a mob, to apprehend and try the leaders and inciters of the lawlessness, exercising some forbearance towards those who were induced or deluded into joining," but the government in this case acted more severely against the most insignificant 'communist' than it had usually acted against many actual rioters and rebels. "Conceding," the report asserts, "that the purpose of the proscribed parties was as charged to overthrow the government of the United States by force there has not been the slightest evidence furnished by any of the raids, nor has evidence from any other source been adduced, of any intent presently to carry out such a purpose." The sub-committee recommends as the result of its inquiry the repeal of that part of the act of October 16, 1918, which makes aliens subject to deportation who are members of or affiliated with any organization that entertains a belief in, teaches or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the United States, or its amendment so as to afford an opportunity for the accused to avert deportation by proving before a federal court that he had not taught the doctrine or had in good faith renounced it. As to Mr. Palmer he is dismissed with the statement that "the most charitable view to take of the affair is that the Attorney General was in no ordinary frame of mind because of the dastardly effort, partly successful, to dynamite his house in the summer of 1919."

The report considers it "refreshing to note that the transactions reviewed have not been suffered to pass without emphatic condemnation from the bar" and it enumerates not only Dean Pound and his associates but Secretary Hughes, ex-Senator Beveridge, John Lord O'Brian and Francis Fisher Kane as lawyers who have "unsparingly denounced" the raids. But in our opinion the list of protesting lawyers, distinguished as it is by the ability and standing of its members, is pitifully insignificant considering the importance and the notoriety of the offence. Every lawyer in America is theoretically an officer of the court and an agent of justice. The American government is a government by law and by lawyers. That department of the government whose particular business it is to see that the law is executed "deliberately usurps" powers which "savor of the worst practices of tyranny." Yet the protests from the legal profession are confined to a handful of men. They do not include any of those eminent lawyers who have exhibited most conspicuous zeal in defending and exalting the Constitution. So far as we know the Bar Associations have ignored the whole incident in spite of the fact that it was probably the most violent, lawless and inhumane proceeding which any department of the federal government has committed since the foundation of the Republic. And this outrage was perpetrated for the purpose ostensibly of purging the United States of people who believed in the accomplishment of political objects by measures of violence.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1922, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER; DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY PHILIP LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON ROBERT MORSS LOVETT
STARK YOUNG
ROBERT LITTELL, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evading the Coal Question

FOR months now the newspapers have been filled with idle prattle about the high price of coal, labor cost, liquidation of mine labor, the falling cost of living, and the disproportion between the present level of miners' wages and the prices of other things. Of course, the evidence on all these matters is conflicting. It generally is. President Lewis of the Mine Workers, finds labor cost an infinitesimal factor in the price of coal. The mine operators give it a place of first rate importance. The public is first puzzled, then bewildered; at bottom inclined to agree with the operators because it believes that prices are falling, labor is liquidating, and what is happening so generally, must perforce happen in the coal mines too.

In the past few years the history of coal has been anything but uneventful. Its problems have caught the expert and lay eye, not because it is a model of industrial organization, but because somehow it seems to have failed in the purposes for which an industry is believed to be organized. At the meeting of the American Economic Association in December, 1920, economists, engineers, accountants, geologists, labor leaders, and business men, filled two sessions with their written and oral observations on the sickness of the coal industry. Never was there so much agreement on so intricate a problem. Whatever bias anyone had against bureaucracy, trade unionism, high wages, was there lost in the persistent testimony of the facts that the ills of the industry were organic and lasting and that the cure was drastic control and re-organization. The present leaders of the industry had failed. The next step must be liquidation, not of trade unions or labor, but of a bankrupt and outgrown industrial management.

Nor was this indictment of the coal industry new and unexpected. During the war the two great basic industries of the country, coal mining and transportation, had collapsed together. Plain as was the case for centralized management of the railroads, it was all the more plain with respect to the coal mines. Hence the creation of the Fuel Administration; the fixing of prices; the change of management; the adjustment of labor relations; with the result that the coal jam was reduced to some degree of orderly control.

Knowledge, as is well known, does not necessarily determine policy. In the coal industry it didn't. In fact everyone waited for something new to happen. They were not disappointed. The government's reconstruction policy met the operators' demand for decontrol. Strikes were threatened and actually called in the coal mines. The government intervened and its bituminous and anthracite coal commissions announced their awards. By force and intimidation peace for the moment was restored. But no one was deceived. It was still clear that a little friction would start the conflagration again. Congress turned its attention to coal. Senator Frelinghuysen rediscovered what had been exposed so many times before —chronic under-employment, immense reserves of surplus labor, and an appalling lack of reliable information regarding the conduct and performance of the industry. He therefore set about drafting a bill which provided substantially for nothing more than the creation of a public fact-finding agency. But even this was too fast. The coal lobby was too powerful; the bill was allowed to slumber. The nation again waited for something to happen.

In the meantime the industrial depression came and grew. To their normal lot of under-employment, the miners had added the blessings of unemployment, known in professional circles as cyclical. The situation became serious enough to merit the undivided attention of a separate committee of the President's Unemployment Conference. The facts, such as they are, were studied. It was conceded that conditions were bad. President Lewis of the United Mine Workers appeared before the Committee and urged, in an able statement, constructive consideration of the miners' claim to relief from the disintegrating effects of unemployment. He was given a hearing. Employers in the conference lined up for wage liquidation; labor against it. After a while the conference was suspended. Lewis' recommendations became a matter of historical record. The management of the coal industry continued to do business as before.

The next investigation into coal came from a different angle and for another reason. As if to enliven the course of events in the industry, civil war broke out in West Virginia. The facts of this episode are still fresh in everyone's mind. As usual it began with efforts to unionize unorganized districts and as usual it ended with evictions, private police and guards, armed defence against them and martial law. The immediate effect of government intervention was to stop the march

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the miners. Its permanent result is the perpetuation of the old industrial conditions. Again as before, Congress showed signs of life. Once more it wanted light on the coal question so that it might better guide the future course of public policy. Senator Kenyon now succeeded Senator Frelinghuysen as the student of the coal problem. He, as chairman of the Senate committee of inquiry, visited the seat of the recent disorders, conducted an investigation into their causes, appraised responsibility, and, like his colleague several months before, laid before his fellow statesmen a program of action. The program was concerned with industrial relations. Its note was investigation and publicity, the panacea for all of our industrial ills. Senator Kenyon has since retired into the Judiciary. The country is again on the eve of a strike. Congress has made provision for neither investigation nor publicity.

This bare recital of the outstanding episodes of no more than four years can surely leave no doubt regarding the seat of ultimate responsibility for the disturbances in the coal industry which are reasonably certain to plague Americans during many years to come. If what the public and its representatives wanted were facts, they have for some time been before them in more than sufficient quantity for the purpose of quick and effective action. In spite of almost startling gaps in information on questions of great importance, enough was known about the coal industry and accepted as sound to have enabled the adoption of an efficient policy of industrial control. That no such policy was adopted, or even seriously considered is the result not of ignorance, but of apathy, and perhaps of fear. The administration knows that what's wrong with the coal industry is not wages, nor the check-off, nor the intimidation of the non-union miner. The administration knows that what's wrong with the coal industry is the waste of uncoordinated management. And it possesses neither the courage nor the inclination to do anything about it.

It is out of this background that the forces leading to the strike, which is scheduled for April, have developed. From the moment the strike was threatened its issues have been translated into terms of labor cost and union domination. Our media of public information and the spokesmen for the administration have sedulously refrained from illuminating the controversy with those known facts about the industry which would have turned public opinion from discussing such temporary and generally futile measures as a compromise wage adjustment into channels of constructive thinking on the coal problem. So far as the directors of American public policy were concerned, such facts as the enormous wealth in coal resources in the United States, the misuse of these resources by private interests, the frequent and patent disregard of the public interest by the coal operators, and the misery of the coal miners in West Virginia, were state secrets, to be whispered in confidence over the conference table.

Whatever the motive or lack of motive for its policy, the effect of it has indubitably been to play directly into the hands of the coal operators. From the first they have apparently wanted to force a showdown. Unemployment in the mines had been general and severe; the meager personal resources of the miners had been rapidly exhausted; the union was torn by internal dissension; the support of local and federal authorities had spelt defeat for the union in West Virginia and Alabama; the courts might be depended upon to lend what aid they could to relieve the operators of what they called the burdens of the check-off system. What better time to create and spread irrelevant issues, to make demands which by their very nature could not be accepted by organized workers, and then to engage in pitched battle for the purpose of exterminating a union? The outlook for victory is bright, why not seize the opportunity? So the operators have refused to enter into conference with the union—how public decency would have been outraged if the union had refused to confer with the operators!—and the public looks on with equanimity. Forgotten are the indictments of management, the testimony of experts and experience. The public feels easy. The stocks of coal are large. If the strike lasts no more than three months, the public will not be inconvenienced by it. Its interests are protected. So let the fight proceed.

And this is how at present matters in the coal industry stand. Not a pretty picture, it is true. But probably a fair one. All that the friends of the miners can ask for them is that the fight, if the fights comes off, shall be a fair one. Government intervention, if we may judge by the past, will do no more than make a bad situation worse. If we may judge by the past the six hundred thousand men who work in the coal mines cannot afford to entrust their destinies to the benevolence of either the public or the mine operators. To them destruction of their union would mean disaster. So much at least they know and therefore they accept the challenge of the operators. Should they win the fight, they will still have their essential problems to solve. Possibly they will learn this time that their salvation in the industry lies in being part of a cohesive labor movement, whose goal under the circumstances must needs be political as well as economic.

LEO WOLMAN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contagious Poverty

ONE of the oldest financial and commercial notions in the world is that people get rich by making others poor.

Salesmanship has always had the same psychology as thievery. "One man's loss is another's gain!" Such is the proverbial wisdom of a society bent on harassing customer, debtor or vanquished foe till his pockets are empty and his back bare.

This view, however, was long ago discredited in the matter of wages and employment. Employers at first thought it good policy to get all they could out of their help without concerning themselves with the welfare of the workingman. Then it became apparent that a sickly and underfed working class meant ruin for the nation. The era of social legislation began.

The same development is now taking place in the relations of merchant and customer. Sellers are finding that it pays better to enrich and fatten the buyer than it does to bleed him white. In a commercial civilization inexorable stripping of the consumer entails bankruptcy for producer and middleman. Thus historical materialism concludes with a justification of pity!

The war of 1914-18 proves the absurdity of basing the prosperity of one portion of the world on the impoverishment of another portion; and world unity in large measure comes about, not because men in their enlightenment have willed it, but through the pressure of material forces stronger than the greed of men. We finally realize that patriotic hatreds can subsist only under conditions of international poverty. Peoples were early on their guard against the contagion of diseases. It never occurred to anybody that the way to keep one nation free of small-pox was to produce and perpetuate an epidemic in an adjoining state. Not so in the matter of business. Everybody thought his nation would be richer if some other one were poorer.

Commercial internationalism of the pre-war type could still assert that it was to the interest of one nation to subjugate another. Now we see that a state in attacking its neighbor attacks itself. The Great War demonstrates empirically, in other words, the solidarity of mankind. Norman Angell's idea that war impoverishes all the belligerents, even the collector of the indemnity, is so true that we may go further and say that war unites its participants in repairing the damage they have done each other. It develops that you must lift the vanquished to his feet and fill his pocketbook, before you can make anything by exploiting him.

Now France is loath to recognize this international solidarity which is not of her invention. This should not prove surprising. France has been reasoning that it is simple justice for Germany to make good the damage Germany is responsible for. Germany naturally wants to avoid this penalty and keep as much of her money away from France as she can. In both cases sentiment is blinding the public mind to a common interest.

Both were wrong originally in seeking pretexts for war with each other on historical grounds. Now both are wrong in discussing payments on grounds of justice. The error is not one of logic, but one of fact. They should look at the matter from the viewpoint of common profit. Here is the vicious circle: Germany must restore France, but before she can do that France must restore German wealth. The solution of this paradox, however, would not help either of them much if other nations, Austria and Russia, for instance, remained meanwhile in penury.

A clear definition of world unity has been furnished not by philosophy and ethics, but by business. Commerce forces us to a conclusion that religion has never been able adequately to impose: that war is an utterly stupid thing. Contempt for the merchant is an old-fashioned error due to aristocratic prejudice and to the attractiveness of the gentleman's calling. Among the numerous ways of classifying men that may be thought of, a most important one is to distinguish producers from middlemen. Producers act upon raw materials and add to these the value of their labor. Middlemen act upon people, from whom they derive a profit which comes to be added to the values of the goods produced. The closer men become associated, and the more widely civilization extends, the greater the control of seller over worker, of middleman over producer.

A nation without salesmen would be ruined by the fruits of its own labor, the very accumulation of which would reduce it to poverty. The world long suffered for lack of sufficient labor. Now it has come to suffer from the sheer wealth of its productivity. The advantage of the single individual alone by himself on an island is the bane of a collectivity, for the output of labor must be consumed, otherwise prices drop, and wages, equipment, national wealth itself, depreciate. From all of these evils the seller is our saviour.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The merchant is the great fraternizer of humanity. He does much more for world peace than any religion. Nevertheless, religion and commerce have been stupid enough to support armies and to seek their own prosperity in war. All nations have relied on God and economic competition to crush rival sellers and producers. Long before religions have come to the brotherhood of all the children of God, commerce has discovered that customers must be coddled. In driving the money changers from the temple, Jesus made a gross mistake in political economy; for business is today realizing that world brotherhood for which Christianity has appealed in vain.

The concept of world unity has made greatest progress among the commercial peoples—the Americans and the English. A country like the United States, a country that sells, can no longer shrug its shoulders if peoples such as the Poles or the Serbs go to war. Nothing that happens in Europe can fail to affect America. We used to say that people would be so disgusted with militarism, after the experiences of recent years, that they would be through with war forever. If, in fact, we are not entirely cured of our old pugnacity, we are at least blessed with a new commercial spirit that may prove to be the salvation of the world. After one attack of contagious poverty, the world is ready for a world-wide hygiene of peace. The epidemic of poverty at present raging is proof positive of world solidarity.

This actual experience of universalism is one of the greatest things in the history of civilization; for we are now confronted not with a vague aspiration, not with a utopian program, but with a fact. It takes facts of such magnitude and such impressiveness to make men think straight, understand things they never understood before, though they have been doing them for ages. Chemistry and mechanics used to claim that by increasing and perfecting the instruments of destruction they would first shorten and finally abolish war. The inventor of high explosives would be a benefactor to humanity by giving men an overdose of systematized slaughter, and hence a distaste for it. This hope has proved a disappointment. Homicidal science, turned to the service of international hatreds, has proved unable to exhaust the reserves of human spite. Can we now afford to entrust the salvation of the world to a scientific faith, as we once did to religion? The answer is that commerce has stolen a march on both science and religion, imposing world unity upon us.

Labor is still at cross-purposes with itself in its laws and in its theory. One moment it finds that war is necessary if it would sell its products; the next it sees how foolish it is to kill and impoverish customers, along with a criminal wastage of natural riches. Scientific power may be already at work preparing for the next war. Commercial power is the only force actively at work to prevent such a catastrophe. For commerce has discovered the law of contagious poverty.

But what will the nations do when they have won back their wealth? Will they use it to reduce each other to poverty again? Economic internationalism may very well revive sentimental nationalism, the latter waiting until commerce has paid enough in taxes for the state to reconstitute its military system. As soon as Germany has recovered through industry and trade, she will want her military revenge. That is why France is bent on keeping her too poor ever to attack again. Can we get a solidarity of prosperity once we have issued from the solidarity of poverty? Penury leads to union through the humiliation of destroying nationalism. Abundance leads to combativeness through the exaltation of enriched nationalism. England wants a strong Germany to do business with. France wants a weak Germany incapable of starting another war. Can we revive commerce without reviving war?

The best guarantee of peace is the continuation of poverty until such time as the peoples of Europe can think in some other terms than those of the various nationalisms and historical hatreds and come to a union from which no one—French, German or Russian—is excluded.

Who, primarily, is standing in the way of this? What nation is the most self-centred, the most content to think of itself alone, the most inclined to distrust the creation of a truly European spirit and a truly humanitarian economic system? No one need be told that it is France. But we must sympathize with her before condemning. France is the last to welcome these new tendencies, because she would be the first to suffer should they prove fallacious. She would guarantee peace by the old-fashioned agencies of war. She would be the first in arms in order not to be the first attacked. She is not willing to take chances. She stands on her rights, and demands just what is due her. Juridically, here, she is unassailable. Humanly she is pitiable, drawing sullenly into her shell, and answering the assault of new ideas from the rest of the world by denying them without argument. Humanity is always looking for a faith. France is capable of nothing but character. Obstinate, curt of speech, doggedly certain of the unchanging nature of her history, she is the nation of Jeanne d'Arc rather than of the Revolution. Her whole soul is bent, not on preaching a philo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sophy, but on resisting an encroachment. She points to the motto on her coat-of-arms: "Dieu et mon droit"—"God and my due!" and she comments, for the benefit of Germany: "Pay up!"

France has the soul of a creditor, and of a creditor not over-shrewd; because she is wasting her time and taxing the reserve energies of world opinion in demanding punishment for the guilty Germans—a punishment harder and harder to inflict the longer it is deferred. Peoples have to remember, in order to keep the vindictive spirit alive; and now they have something else to think of than their indignation; they have poverty. France is thinking soundly, but off the point. Her intelligence is stalled on a siding. It is not getting there on time. The men who perished on her battlefields took part of her mind with them to destruction. The mental enthusiasm that died with all these dead would perhaps have kept her broadly human, broadly sympathetic. In the name of those dead she is deliberately and stubbornly intractable. But she must not be hated for this momentary distraction. In the war just past she lost fortune, bodily health, philosophy.

And now, after she has given up a million and a half in killed, the world demands of her a new dispensation. She is asked for a Mirabeau and a humanitarian patriotism. She can give only a Poincaré and an anti-German patriotism. This situation may change, but only in so far as Germany herself expresses a German aspiration toward human brotherhood, a German faith in a new spirit, a German passion for democracy.

The world is longing for the end of contagious poverty; and it has one hope thereof—a hope it dares not express, though it has nourished it through the centuries, and though, without its realization, Europe will forever remain a house divided against itself. It is the hope of a Franco-German alliance—the basic condition for a United States of Europe and for peace in the world!

PIERRE HAMP.

He Walks with His Chin in the Air

Life in you is an incurious madness.
Tell me, how good is life that is not known
And is but felt, like wind against the temples,
Like touch beneath the feet, of turf or stone?

But do not hear me, Lover of life; an answer
Is burning like a sorrow in my breast:
There is flame in feeling, fineness in the knowing,
And who shall say which way of life is best?

Pass on, Seeker, seeking the touch of spaces.
Many the ways of life, and many a one
Is all too brief a fluttering of hours
To serve our purpose here beneath the sun.

HAZEL HALL.

Prison—and the American Scene

SUPPER is over, and we are back in our cells for the night. From five o'clock until seven the next morning, we shall be enclosed, two in each cell, two in each little stone and iron coffin, seven feet by three-and-a-half.

The guards walk softly and swiftly along the galleries, counting the men. The cell-house bell clangs twice sharply; the count is correct. No one has escaped. The human stock is all properly assorted and stalled.

Then come the "runners" with the evening papers. If you wish, and if you have the price, you may subscribe to a daily paper. All the political prisoners do so; and this is the cell-house where the "politicals" are housed.

There comes a silence, broken by a slight rustling. The boys are tearing the heart out of the evening's news. They are rushing down the columns, searching for certain headlines: "Russia," "Strike," "Labor," "West Virginia." And when they come to such a headline, they stiffen, bending forward, frowningly concentrated.

Perhaps tonight's news records a victory—a strike won; a victory of struggling Russia over the harassing Whites. Then you will hear a cry from some cell. Some prisoner wishes to tell a friend, in another cell, to read the item.

"Hey, there, Jack, in Number 52!"

"Yes?"

"Got the Star? Turn to page three—top of the second column!"

Everyone else on that side of the cell-block has heard this, of course; and there is a stirring and rustling as they all hunt for the article. For a few minutes there is silence; and then the voices flash out in happy comment. The guards order less noise. But it is some time before the unusual loudness dies down.

But then comes a silence deeper than that which usually reigns in this rectangular house of grayness. It is the reaction. Now the boys are thinking. . . . They are thinking of their own isolation from the thing which is to them the very core of life. The world whirls on; the molten stream of events flows on tempestuously; there are crashing conflicts and aching defeats and, here and there, a hard won victory. And they are out of it! Condemned to sameness and inaction, to the clogging sluggishness of prison.

And that night it is not just the hardness of the straw bed that keeps sleep from their eyes and unconsciousness from their gnawing minds. It is memory and yearning, and the sterile fever of hope.

This is a scene out of America. Many have been writing of the American Scene. But I can-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not write of it; for the American scene is too broad and varied and changing for me to compass. So I have taken one scene from the shifting panorama of America; and from it one can, perhaps, make some estimate of all America, of America as it has appeared to me, a foreigner, in my ten years' sojourn.

You see, in England they do not allow convicts to subscribe to newspapers. They may permit this in certain special cases, but it is certainly not allowed to the ordinary convict. And we in Leavenworth Penitentiary were quite ordinary convicts; for the Department of Justice makes no distinction between political and other prisoners. In fact, have we not heard, hundreds of times, the statement that "there are no political prisoners in America?"

So in America convicts may subscribe to newspapers; they may play outdoor games in the summer; they may receive all the letters sent to them—provided they pass the prison censorship. They have many privileges which come not within the fairest dreams of British prison reformers.

But in America, also, prisoners are occasionally beaten up. In some American prisons they have still the whipping post. In Leavenworth, although there is no whipping post, they chain men to the bars of their cell doors for hours at a time. And they will permit other prisoners—"favorites"— to enter punishment cells and to beat the occupants with baseball bats.

Also, in American prisons, there is much favoritism: there are men in American prisons who are prisoners hardly more than in name. They are permitted to go outside the walls, to eat at a special table, even to wear civilian clothes. Some of these men have earned these privileges through sheer merit, others through "playing politics" or through acting as spies upon their fellow inmates.

In English prisons there is no physical brutality; and there is practically no favoritism. In England, the system is implacable: cold, mechanical, relentless, dehumanized. In other words, it is "just." The British system is based upon the hard abstract concept of justice: everyone shall be treated exactly alike—even punishment shall be meted out with all the automatic inevitability and impersonality of a slot machine.

But the Americans are human: they will beat one man and pat another on the back, precisely as you and I treat our enemies and our friends, or as we should like to treat them.

And it seems to me that here is a clue to the whole of America, to that much-discussed but unseizable thing we call the American spirit. For it is true that an American, met casually in a train, at a baseball game, or in a bootlegger's parlor, will—if he likes you—take you home to dine with him, and offer to put you up for a week, with insistent and somewhat boisterous good comradeship. And it is also true that Americans, if they do not like you or your opinions, will beat you, railroad you to jail, tar and feather you or lynch you.

I have called this attitude human. Perhaps that is not quite the right word. I should perhaps have said child-like or emotional. For, it seems to me, in no country in the world are judgments based so completely and intimately upon emotional impulses as in America. And in no country are there fewer checks, fewer rational safeguards placed about the strong and wilful mutations of impulse, than in America.

That is why I love and hate America at the same time. It is because the lush vigor of American emotional energy manifests itself in such varying forms: in shapes that charm and in shapes that horrify. And I think that it is a half-comprehending realization of this wanton prodigality of your emotional life which has made some people—who are rather afraid of it—seek to batten down this crude surging with all manner of inhibitive legislation and suppressive conventions. A hopeless task, indeed! For this raw life cannot be prisoned, it can only be driven or cajoled into new channels. And this insistent vitality of America, which throbs in its power-houses and thunders in its mills, postures abandonedly in its jazz and its religious revivals, and speaks through the mouths of Carl Sandburg and Sherwood Anderson here, and through the mouth of Billy Sunday there—this hot and naked power will not even be denied by its would-be suppressors. Even them it conquers, and makes ecstatic dervishes out of prohibitionists, frenetic mystics out of blue-law advocates. Why even your aesthetic pessimists work harder at their job than those of any other land. I have never seen such eager labor put into absinthine languishings and the pursuit of pale sins as that displayed by the Greenwich Village decadents.

A prison guard in Leavenworth will often chat in a friendly way with a prisoner; he will even confide to him problems of his family or working life, and ask his advice. Such a thing in an English prison is inconceivable. Just as much as a lynching, such as the killing of Frank Little, would be inconceivable in England. Life burns here in England with a steadier fire. It does not rise to lick the stake to which a mutilated Negro is bound; nor, perhaps, does it flame into the sudden beauty of comradeship and sacrifice shown by hundreds of humble workers of the West who would travel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through blizzards and desert, to go to jail for a cause. There is nothing here to equal the color and the tension of an East Side garment workers' strike.

But England has its uses: it provides you with a quiet place in which to sit down in peace to write about America. And it gives you a far-off place of calm from which to view America. For American life crashes rather too incessantly and demandingly upon one's consciousness; its drama sucks you into its own vortex; it is hard to remove from this strong and tumultuous life, in order to write about it.

Over there, your armies of gunmen and strikers are deployed, ready to shoot death into each other's camps. There is raw conflict in America. Over there, your artists and poets, weaned at last from the withered breasts of Europe, are beginning to express, inchoately, perhaps, but significantly, the dark and varied complexities of American life. The women's clubs are discussing Dostoievsky or Hamsun, superficially, indeed, but interestedly. The American Legion riots in Kansas City; and the Holy Rollers dance and howl ecstatically in small towns of New Jersey. And a great crowd, red-mouthed and frenzied, roars thunderously when Babe Ruth hits a homer.

Out of this turmoil, what will come? Out of your whelming strengths and appalling weaknesses, what will be forged? What giant thing is struggling for form in the womb of America? Will it be a great brute tyranny of vulgarity; or will some shining glory of comradeship and power emerge to make a new morning for the world?

And it is because they sense this struggle and this imminence, and because they will that it shall come with beauty and fulfillment for us all, that a hundred men still scan eagerly the newspapers, every quiet evening, in their cells, at Leavenworth.

CHARLES ASHLEIGH.

The Plight of the English Tories

THE Morning Post said in its bitterness a long time ago that Mr. Lloyd George, having broken the Liberal party, would next break the Conservatives. From the Morning Post's standpoint, he is now in process of doing it. A neutral would more accurately say that the Conservative party is breaking itself upon his personality. The spectacle inevitably recalls another party-breaker, who split the liberals in the eighties over Ireland and the Unionists in 1904-6 over Protection—Joseph Chamberlain, who had strong points of resemblance to Mr. George, for he was a man of the people, a radical but devoid of the Liberal sense of personal and national liberty, restless, impatient, innovating, a rousing demagogue.

The hubbub has arisen out of the famous "February election" which I said in my last letter in the New Republic had been decided on before the Premier went to Cannes. The decision had in fact been taken. Mr. George disavowed all responsibility for the report when he came back from Cannes and the project was abandoned. It is a perpetual puzzle to him (how Fleet Street enjoys the little joke;) that such rumors should get into the papers. But Lord Birkenhead, who never uses a rapier if there is a bludgeon handy, has made no bones about it. He says squarely that he was in favor of having an election "in the early part of the year," that in three months' time his Tory friends will be sorry that they did not have it then, and that they could have had it in his opinion with certainty of success. The inference is that in Lord Birkenhead's opinion there would be no such certainty now. That, at least, is sober truth. The Conservative party is in the rapids and unless it is very wary it will be split upon the rocks. We have had three by-elections lately in each of which a Conservative candidate had to meet the combined Opposition vote, which means the whole Liberal Labor poll less an unknown but certainly very small number of Liberal-Coalition voters. Result:—

Constituency	Conservative Majority in 1918	Opposition Majority Today
Clayton Division of Manchester	4,631	Labor 3,624
North Camberwell	1,658*	Labor 1,135
Bodmin Division of Cornwall	3,583	Ind. Liberal 3,141

This turnover of votes, which if repeated at a general election would reduce the Conservatives to a moderate group, was due to a variety of causes —accumulation of discontents against the government in office, trade depression, crushing taxation, the Geddes report (both because some of its recommendations with regard to education are resented and because the suggestion that great economies are immediately possible is accepted as proof positive of governmental sins), and the dissention in the Conservative party which is now un-

* Over Liberal and Labor combined.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concealed and takes the form of a brisk exchange of bickerings, reproaches and threats among its leading men. It provides excellent "copy" for the newspapers, admirable missiles for the party's enemies and the coldest of douches for the party itself.

The February election may have been abandoned partly because the government suddenly remembered the necessity of carrying through the Irish settlement, but in any case they could scarcely have persevered in the plan after Sir George Younger, the head of the Conservative "machine", had publicly pronounced against it. Sir George Younger represents the intransigent Tories who are weary of being dragged along a Liberal road by Mr. George. They are the genuine Right of English politics, they are sincere reactionaries and —to their credit be it said—they are tired of compromises and want the policy that matches their convictions. Sir George Younger demanded in particular that this government should undertake the reform of the House of Lords, by which he meant the abolition of the Parliament act, that is to say the restoration of the veto. Mr. George also is dissatisfied with the Parliament act, because it holds up in the Lords all really Liberal bills for two years and so undermines the Liberal government that is the author of them. He wants not more veto but less. The Die-Hard Tories want a veto that can be relied on not only to delay but actually to destroy Radical and Labor legislation.

Sir George Younger's intervention put the fat in the fire. He had really, whatever the denials, presented an ultimatum to the Premier, and at the same time to his own leaders. The word lay with Mr. Austen Chamberlain. When he spoke it was found that the principles on which the two parties were to conduct the next election had been agreed between the leaders. Or perhaps one might better say the lack of principles. There would be no "coupon" from the party leaders for Coalition candidates. There would be no joint address to the electors. So much to tickle the palate of Tories who dislike the idea of Coalition. But is independence, then, to take the place of Coalition? At this point Mr. Chamberlain really got to the heart of his subject. "For whose profit," said he to his Tory audience, "will you quarrel with our Liberal friends? In doing so you will destroy our chances in a great number of constituencies which we hold now and never should hold and never could get without their help." Therefore independence was impossible. Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Chamberlain would enter the next election with an understanding as to what they wanted and how they proposed to get it. This, of course, meant a continuance of Coalition, slightly modified in method but in essentials unchanged. It would be based on a mutual surrender of principle, as it has always been. Mr. Chamberlain cheerfully indicated his sacrifice; he was a convinced Protectionist but to "go out" (like that great crusader, his father) with the old program of protection at this time would be "perfect madness." Mr. Lloyd George, no doubt, was to stomach the continuance of the Key Industries bill, though *his* conviction is free trade. Having made this brazen electioneering speech, Mr. Chamberlain demanded continued cooperation with those who "stand for the same great fundamental principles as we."

This was too much for Sir George Younger. All that he would assent to, he said, was "a sort of cooperation." At present there was a matrimonial alliance, and he would end it by a Bill of Divorcement. But he would not turn the Coalition "completely adrift" so long as they were willing to march with the Tories "in the policies which they considered best." Once more Sir George was issuing orders both to his own leaders and to the Premier. Lord Birkenhead looked round for his bludgeon. He said roundly that the suggestion that the Conservative party should make an independent appeal to the country was a "counsel of insanity"; they had not the slightest chance of gaining a working majority; the Manchester by-election had been lost because the Conservatives had repelled the assistance of the Coalition Liberals; the Premier would not submit indefinitely to the humiliations which rebellious Tories were inflicting on him; he himself, Lord Birkenhead, would not stand it and, besides, the cabin-boy had better let the helm alone. Fisticuffs among the leaders spell demoralization among the rank and file. The "balancing electorate," the "residuum" which used to decide the fate of elections by swaying from side to side, is now a large proportion of the whole. It will not support a party which is publicly riven by dissensions as was Mr. Balfour's in 1905 and as is Mr. Chamberlain's today. It demands, as Lord Birkenhead most truly said, "a coherent and intelligent doctrine which is expressed by men who understand their own minds." The Conservatives have neither the doctrine nor the men and they are going to the wall.

The anger of the Die-Hards is sincere and justified. They are supporting a Premier who is a Liberal. He does not say so himself, because he regards himself for the moment as above party, but he has said so plainly enough through the mouthpieces who are high up in his ministry and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

share his confidence. This means that the policy of his ministry will contain just as much of the Liberal doctrine as he can persuade his Conservative colleagues to swallow—and he has persuaded them to swallow much. When the sterner Tories reflect that their party has been brought to accept the Irish settlement; that, shrinking and protesting, it will nevertheless be brought to accept a similar "surrender" in Egypt; that it has not raised a murmur over the naval disarmament imposed at Washington and the beginnings of a policy of renunciation by the restoration to China of Wei-hai-Wei; that it supports Mr. George's progress, halting indeed but unbroken, towards the reconstitution of Russia and his readiness to negotiate, as they say, with murder and rebellion everywhere—when they ponder on this strange and abhorrent phenomenon, it is no wonder that they are appalled at their political future and demand a Conservative course for the Conservative ship.

If the Conservative revolt is pressed successfully, both the Conservative and the National-Liberal (Coalition) parties will suffer in the next election. The history of the Clayton by-election is sufficiently illuminating. There was a Conservative candidate who was independent but was prepared to support the Coalition as long as it did what he desired it should do. There was also a Labor candidate, Mr. Sutton, who had formerly sat in Parliament for this same neighborhood but is not a man of any distinction or force of character. The Free Liberals approached the Coalition Liberals in Manchester and offered to join in running a Liberal candidate "without adjectives." Coalition Liberal headquarters in London gave no support to this idea; indeed, they emitted no opinion at all until the moment for action had passed. They simply stood aside. The Conservative organizers, for their part, did not desire, and would not accept, cooperation with the Liberals. They stood on their own feet, the bulk of the Liberal vote went to Labor, and Mr. Sutton was returned with a majority of several thousands.

If there could now be straight fighting between Conservatives and either of the two Opposition parties, the result of Clayton would be repeated in many scores of constituencies throughout the country. But such straight fights are very difficult to obtain, and wherever both a Labor man and a Free Liberal are in the field together the Conservative is likely to hold his ground. No general bargain or "pact" to abstain from competing candidatures can be made between the headquarters of the two parties. Liberal headquarters would be ready and so would be some members of the Labor headquarters staff. But these things rest with the local associations, which will not accept dictation from headquarters, and in the constituencies may be found every degree of reasonableness and its reverse on either side. The Labor people are poor tacticians and they take a stiff uncompromising view from which their more prudent leaders have not the courage to dissuade them. To them the Liberals, all Liberals, are no better than the Tories; they are all bourgeoise, reactionaries, "the Capitalists" and so forth. This doctrinaire and inexact division is of great assistance to the Coalition ministers, whose chief hope of success lies in creating a solid anti-Socialist block of the middle and upper working classes. It also deprives the Labor party of the middle class brains which it very badly needs even now in opposition and will need more urgently still when at last it has the responsibility of office. But at the present the most to be hoped for is that up and down the country there will be a series of common sense arrangements by which Labor and Free Liberals will get out of each other's way. Then the causes which operated so strikingly at Bodmin, North Camberwell and Clayton will produce the like results.

Mr. Lloyd George is not too fortunate at the present moment. He is himself in sympathy with the liberal movement—a small "l"—which is moving the country. The country wants economy and peace—in Ireland, Egypt, Europe, everywhere. That is a program common to all the parties and politicians—except the Die-Hard Tories—and it is Mr. George's. But he has not yet delivered the goods, he has committed many sins of omission and commission, he can only go on promising, and the Tory revolt conveys the impression everywhere of weakness in his conduct of affairs. It would be fatal to him if he allowed that to continue and he has now informed Mr. Chamberlain plainly that Sir George Younger must be restrained or he will cease to lead the Coalition. If he did that and the Conservatives took office, Mr. George would move back at once towards reunion with the Liberal party of which he would quickly and inevitably become the head. If the Conservative party split, then its leaders would do all they could to persuade Mr. George to join them and take the headship of a Centre party.

Just at this crisis comes the Geddes report. Mr. George invented the Geddes Committee to show that he was in earnest about economy and to put pressure on his ministers. The Committee reports that enormous reductions are already possible and Mr. George is promptly blamed for not having enforced them long ago.

Worst of all, the report has touched education in a way calculated to do the greatest electoral damage to the government. The average English elector

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not vastly concerned about the education of his children; he has never valued it except where he could see its immediate practical advantage. But the teachers, who are an important influence on public opinion, are concerned about their salaries and pensions, and the working class mothers, who now have the vote, are indignant at the proposal to turn all children under six out of the national schools. The mothers may have their doubts about education, but none about desirability of schools for children over four. The government have rejected these two recommendations firmly, but they will pay a heavy penalty for their mere publication.

How, then, should one summarize the situation? If Mr. George dissolves, the Coalition government will appeal to the country in a loose alliance. It will be the Coalition still, but weaker and apologetic, and it will pay the inevitable penalty for moral weakness. As things stand at the moment, the two governing sections are likely to come back to Parliament as groups rather than parties. It is just conceivable that they might again be able to maintain a ministry in office. That will depend partly on the Die-Hard Tory group. After the elections the indications are that the Coalition will speedily disappear altogether and that Mr. George will thereafter appeal to the country as a leader, a Liberal leader, pure and simple. In my personal belief he will in that event before long be accepted as *the* Liberal leader also. But this is prophecy and dangerous. Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Birkenhead certainly hope for a fusion and a Centre party, but I think it more likely that Mr. George has made up his mind to a definitely Liberal policy and a bid for the leadership of a united Liberal party. It would suit him vastly better if he could now, by resigning instead of dissolving, put the Tories into office and himself, in opposition, conquer the place of indisputed Liberal leader.

The Free Liberals and Labor men should return to Parliament greatly strengthened. In cooperation they might be able to form a ministry. But it is doubtful whether such a ministry would have any stability even if Labor would go into it—or dare go into it in face of its own extremists.

There is a large measure of truth in Lord Birkenhead's uncomplimentary references to the amiable weakness, in face of the extremists, of Labor leaders like Mr. Clynes and Mr. Henderson. Possibly Labor might even be so strong as to attempt the formation of a government of its own, though that is unlikely. We are seemingly on the threshold—so long foretold—of the group system, and all is uncertainty. There is a great dearth of dividing principles. Everything turns on personalities, or rather on one man's personality.

AN ENGLISH LIBERAL.

Yourself and Your Critics

The First Fifty Years, by Henry Myers. The Princess Theatre, March 13, 1922.

THE question of the actor's relation to his part is still an open one. Shall he identify himself with the character, try to produce an illusion of being the very person that he represents? Or shall he only make use of himself to comment on the character, to abstract the quality that distinguishes the character, and in terms of himself give us that quality with a significant accentuation? This whole problem is happily illustrated by the work of Miss Clare Eames and Mr. Tom Powers in The First Fifty Years. And to this illustration the nature of Mr. Myers' play contributes no little.

The First Fifty Years is in seven scenes, seven episodes really, out of the lives of a Harlem clerk and his wife. We see them first at the homecoming after the honeymoon, very much in love and planning to be happy so long as they both shall live. There is a letter from an old suitor of Anne's in which he tells them that he will write every anniversary and will remind them to question their hearts and their love. And though there is little money Anne will do all the work for him, and will practice her music; and Martin will become the head of his firm and will go on writing his poems. The first anniversary comes, the paper wedding, which they have almost forgotten; she has become a drudge and he gets on all too slowly in his affairs; they question their hearts and almost quarrel, and end by resolving to keep their hearts open and true to each other. The Wooden Wedding comes, five years since they were married. They quarrel; he all but strikes her; finally they promise not to speak to each other again, though they must live together for fear of what people will say. Then comes a scene where Martin eats his supper; neither of them speaks; he goes out, and Anne sits at her game of solitaire and begins to sob. It is the tenth anniversary; they both have remembered, but neither has spoken. The Crystal Wedding then, fifteen years, Martin is ill, Anne cares for him, always without speaking. She is forced at last to break this silence and she tells him that as soon as he is well she is going to leave him. But his entreaties keep her; they agree to be strangers but not enemies, to make the best of things. And then the Silver Wedding, and both of them old before their time; they can talk together; they even make little presents for the occasion. Martin has got on in the world, people think the marriage a perfect one. The scene ends with their playing cards together. And then the fiftieth anniversary, the Golden Wedding. Two old people, worn out, little tilts and bickerings without much feeling one way or another. Life is neither sweet nor bitter any more. Memories; and in their absent-mindedness a passage of the old love. And in the midst of it Martin wanders back to the cards.

The First Fifty Years is pretty well worked out; in spite of the fact that it tends to be hard and abrupt in texture, in the first half especially. The whole thing is frankly an arrangement; it is episodic in nature and rightly so in structure; and the author has wisely refrained from the historical and atmospheric, which after Milestones and its school would have been the obvious method. The very shortness and the single-mindedness of the scenes in themselves is what does most to make the technique successful; but the play in general is deft enough, as far as it goes, and it is not without profound feeling at times. And its author evinces a real talent and insight in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his avoidance of mere harshness at the conclusion. He accomplishes this not through any sentimentality, moonlight, silver threads among the gold, or the sweet wisdom of years, but through reducing the personal elements involved and through relying on the truth, drab though it be, that, if we have found no other, the mere fading down of the life within us will bring at last a kind of peace.

Mr. Tom Powers as Martin does very good work. In the first act he has not taken the pains to discover some significant points by which he can indicate the character, but merely slides through on what persuasive ways he has in stock. But he seems nearly always to be first the clerk and then the softening, coarsening old man declining into age and decrepitude. The identification with the part is carried to a sort of superficial and ill differentiated obviousness, even, at times; as when, for one instance, he enters with his white hairs and his staff in the final scene; which is the kind of thing that an audience will always applaud with exactly the same kind of enthusiasm that it shows for the trained seal who smokes a pipe. But Mr. Powers' playing, more or less casual as it too often is, has in one scene at least, that in which he lies weak and helpless from a long illness and is broken up by his wife's unchanging distance and detestation and threats of leaving him, remarkable effect and power. So much for the illusion, the identification with the actual character, that Mr. Powers approaches.

Miss Eames, on the other hand, would never be taken for the young Harlem wife when she appears in the first scene. And it is in this scene that she is least successful, and, for audiences fed on realism of the simpler and more photographic type, will be least satisfactory. Later on she is better in every way; she hits a happier mean between presentation and photography. And to those of her audience who found the first act so lacking, she is far more satisfying. But this is not for the reasons that they think. It is not because Miss Eames is more the character, more the particular woman in this particular flat; not at all. It is because there are more carrying and positive qualities in the play at these points; and because she is better able to present these qualities, and through them to give us what this woman means and what life means as it is expressed by her. In one scene, for example, the husband and wife do not speak to one another; and he eats his supper in silence and puts on his hat and coat and goes out and leaves her there at the little table playing solitaire. And she sits on there for a moment with the foolish cards, and then buries her head in her arms and breaks into sobs. Here it is not the Harlem wife that weeps; otherwise we might as well have in a broken and bitter little woman from some dull flat to do the part. Nor is it a mere felicity of casual imitation. What we get really is the comment of an artist's discerning mind on this crisis of grief and desolation and waste in the woman's life. What we get is the sense of a capable imagination that abstracts, deduces, criticizes and widens the moment, and gives us a kind of passionate judgment on the depth of its intensity and its application to all human life.

In spite of the pull in the reverse direction by so many people, and in spite of the fact that superficially it may seem that these people ought to be right, the fact remains that great actors are always themselves. Duse, Bernhardt, Chaliapin, Grasso, Ellen Terry, Nijinsky, are always themselves under their various parts. And Charlie Chaplin, who never loses his identity for a moment and who is always himself and always all the comic absurdity and the burlesqued and pitiful pathos and the blundering confusion of life, is the best known and final proof on this point. These great actors in themselves supply a sort of continuity of radiance that shines through and illuminates and makes visible the quality of the characters they assume.

So that Miss Eames will make a great mistake if she listens too much to those of her critics, often friendly enough, who are worried over the fact that she is always herself; who may regret her inability to obscure herself behind a Harlem housewife. Whereas, on the contrary, Miss Eames' one hope of becoming a great actress—and when I think of that beautiful suppression and that tragic mask as she leaned over the sick man and went about his irritable wants, I can believe that she may very well be a great actress some day—lies in the opposite direction. She may pull out all her hair and be a witch if she likes, or someone else's hair and be a shrew; but that need imply nothing as art. In so far as she is of any importance she will always be Clare Eames, not Medea nor Lady Macbeth nor Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch. And in so far as she is to achieve any style in her art the same thing holds true, since style is the man, as Buffon said and everybody has heard. Her style will develop and mature precisely as she is able to free herself through characters which actually she is not, but whose essence she is capable of expressing in terms of what she is. And already there are passages of a style that is admirable: as, for instance, in that last scene, where the old woman sits knitting, the full skirt tucked in under the thin knees and all the body's frame softened into a lean oblivion. And this style comes not so much through a facile imitative effect, though there was the right amount of that, or through easy relaxation and assurance, but through a distinction of character and through a poignant selection and creation of ideas.

You get the sense of steady growth in Miss Eames' acting. The real problem ahead of her is to perfect the means by which a great actor achieves his ends, which consists really in being able to extract the quintessences of a part, express them in terms of himself, and then dominate the whole to such an extent that we say it is indeed the very character. Her business will be to remain herself forever; but to cause to grow in herself such beauty of mind and presence, such flexibility and fluidity and eloquent magnetism of body, and such sympathy of the imagination as may be translated into compelling presentations of human character and living. For only through this translation of the character into himself can an actor profess to be an artist at all and the "lord of another's soul."

STARK YOUNG.

Self-Portrait

A lens of crystal whose transparence calms
Queer stars to clarity, and disentangles
Fox-fires to form austere refracted angles:
A texture polished on the horny palms
Of vast equivocal creatures, beast or human:
A flint, a substance finer-grained than snow,
Graved with the Graces in intaglio
To set sarcastic sigil on the woman.

This for the mind, and for the little rest
A hollow scooped to blackness in the breast,
The simulacrum of a cloud, a feather:
Instead of stone, instead of sculptured strength,
This soul, this vanity, blown hither and thither
By trivial breath, over the whole world's length.

ELINOR WYLIE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMMUNICATION

From President Angell of Yale

SIR: In your interesting editorial as to the Public Profession of the Law in the issue of February 22nd, you refer to a paper of mine to be delivered on February 23rd before the Bar Association in Washington.

As the paper may well be somewhat slow in finding its way into print, you may be interested to know that, so far as I can ascertain, the present scholarship and loan funds available to impecunious students in our colleges are quite inadequate to care for present needs. If any considerable portion of the students in law schools requiring, for entrance only graduation from a high school, were to enter the colleges for two years of pre-legal training, and were in large part found to be dependent on scholarships or similar financial aid, the resources at present at the disposal of college authorities would be hopelessly insufficient.

As there is some reason to believe that a large fraction of the students in the lower grade law schools could not undertake two years of college work without some substantial financial assistance, the practical consequences of the adoption of the recommendations of the Bar Association Committee are obvious. Very large additional scholarship and loan funds must be provided, otherwise many of the men now in the law schools under consideration will be discouraged from attempting the practice of the law. Whether such a result would be unfortunate or not need not be discussed at this time.

Nor is it necessary to press the familiar assertion that the able lad who is willing to work hard enough can always support himself while securing a college education, and gain some invaluable training in endurance and moral fortitude en route. Happily this is substantially true, but that fact does not very greatly modify the practical consequences above indicated.

Due consideration should, however, be given to the successful efforts now being made, especially in the Middle West, to reduce by one or two years the time required for completing a college and high school course. There is good reason to believe that this can be done with an improvement rather than a deterioration of the training given. The bearing of this possibility on the problem under discussion is obvious. JAMES R. ANGELL.

New Haven, Connecticut.

[In commenting upon the proposal of the American Bar Association for lifting the pre-professional standards of education for admission to the Bar, the New Republic pointed out that the acceptance of this proposal depends upon the assurance of access to the necessary higher education to the poor but capable. Otherwise, the proposal of the Bar Association would make for the exclusion of all but the well-to-do from that profession "by which, more than by any other profession, the economic life and the government of the country are moulded." Such a program would, of course, be intolerable. The plain import of President Angell's argument is that the Bar Association proposal, standing by itself, would deny access to many of those who are competent but poor from securing the necessary equipment to enter the legal profession. This is the unavoidable inference from the facts which he assumes in his communication, even though one should reconcile himself to the exclusion of many of the men now in the law schools from the practice of the law. Therefore it is clearly incumbent upon the leaders of the Bar Association program, which was accepted at the recent Washington Conference, to make the availability of the necessary higher education to all who are capable of receiving it, irrespective of their financial condition, part and parcel of the program of raising the standards of admission into the legal profession.

But President Angell raises an issue even more fundamental than its immediate application to training for admission to the Bar. The issue is nothing less than the task of bringing our social and economic conditions into correspondence with our democratic political pretensions. The issue was put only the other day to the House of Lords by Lord Haldane, commenting on the wave of uncritical and disastrous "economy." "In the modern state," said Lord Haldane, "the real capital was the energy and ability of the people themselves to create the wealth of a country. The capacity to make that ability effective depended in large measure on training and education, and it was dependent more and more on these things as the years went on . . . . . Apart from the material side of the subject, there was no doubt that access to the higher kind of education brought tranquillity and calmness which were not to be obtained in any other way. . . . The barrier existing between class and class in respect of opportunities of education should be broken down; it caused a sense of injustice among the working classes." Recognition of these truths lies behind the so-called Junior College movement to which President Angell adverts. We have no doubt that a thorough scrutiny of our educational systems will reveal inexcusable waste of time in the four-year high school and four-year college courses. Compression will make for concentration and real training, instead of merely time-spending. We, therefore, heartily welcome the Junior College movement as a serious effort to recognize and deal with one of the deepest problems of our democracy.—THE EDITORS.]

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Baker and the Secret Treaties

SIR: In regard to the statements in Mr. Ray Stannard Baker's articles that the terms of the secret treaties were not known to President Wilson or the State Department before Paris, I wish to say of my own personal knowledge:

1. That documents relating to them passed through Colonel House's hands previous to the drafting of the Fourteen Points at the end of December, 1917.
2. That certain of these points—notably the one relating to France—are unintelligible without reference to the secret treaty between France and Russia.
3. That Secretary Lansing knew about the Pacific treaty in the spring of 1918, because I was one of a number of men who sat with him in front of a map showing the partition and heard him discuss the effect on America's strategic position in the Pacific.

Mr. Baker knows these facts because I explained them to him before his articles were published.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Protestant Churches During the War

SIR: First of all, let me thank you for doing what I asked, in writing as you have, "a more discriminating and constructive editorial." Had you confined it to your constructive proposals I should not have needed to trespass upon your attention again. You have, however, drawn conclusions from premises which you invent and valorously denied things which nobody has asserted.

1. You intimate, with impressive solemnity, that the churches would dispute your contention that "the Christian ministry cannot bring peace on earth and goodwill to men until its members are agreed upon the meaning and the power of the Christian Gospel as a way of life." Your assertion that "a religious truth is not fully believed until it is lived" is, I think, axiomatic in every pulpit every Sunday. Your affirmation that religious truth "requires for its nurture a prolonged and stupendous educational discipline" and that "no propaganda can take the place of such education," would, I assure you, be considered as commonplaces.

Your brave affirmation that "it will be the business of religious leaders to teach men how really to lead a good life" would excite little opposition, I am sure. You go further, however, and state that they now "lack the knowledge and the *disposition* to do this." I feel very sure you are wrong in stating that they are not disposed to teach men how to lead a good life. The majority of preachers, even though they be quite as ignorant as you affirm, are surely desirous that men should lead a good life.

I am a little puzzled by your contention that the teaching process is not possible by either the spoken or the printed word. If this be true, just what intellectual process may be used?

The bases which you declare to be assumed for religious authority are probably still current in some religious circles, but are hardly prevailing, and I am led to wonder how familiar you are with the educational processes of the Christian churches of today.

2. Your second editorial is very different from the first, but inasmuch as you have, as I believe, been inadequate in your interpretation of modern religious ideals, I must ask the privilege of specifically denying, in behalf of American churches, certain of your original assertions, as follows:

Our churches of modern times have not "gloried in war," and I surely must deny your assertions that "the majority of Christians, with the majority of the Christian clergy at their head, believe in the sword as an appropriate weapon of the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth," that "they believe in the conception of holy wars," that "they would justify any lying, hating or glorification of military force." I deny that the "majority of Christians" believe that the "holiness of the cause is itself a sufficient excuse for hating and for lying." All of the these allegations are untrue and would hardly be worthy of notice coming from any less authority than yourself.

3. I must further ask the privilege of setting before your readers the statements of ideals by the churches you disparage. The following indicate the whole tenor of the utterances you depreciate:

> "Let us declare plainly that in every war the Son of Man is put to shame anew and that every battlefield is a Calvary on which Christ is crucified afresh. Let there be throughout the Church a fire of holy indignation against war.
>
> "With a more poignant realization than we have ever had before on the terrible consequences of national selfishness, let us humbly confess our own share of sin in participating in the race of armaments, in seeking our own advantage regardless of neighbors, in adding to the world's burden of suspicion and distrust. Let us, as a people, open wide our hearts to the divine spirit of love and brotherhood revealed to us in its fullness by Jesus Christ. Let us dedicate ourselves anew to building in this war-ridden earth the City of God foretold by the mouth of prophets since the world began.
>
> "It is not enough to say to the nations—'be good.' *We must find out what it is to be good in this modern world.*
>
> "Above all things else, the Washington Conference calls—let us dare to say it—for vision, for moral and spiritual idealism. It needs to be led by what Christians call the Spirit of God, to have what the followers of Jesus term the mind of Christ. Whatever be the forms of faith of its members, it calls for spiritual devotion to those ideals of humanity which all nations at their best, share with each other. For our own representatives, let us pray without ceasing, that God may guide them with His own hand.
>
> "Does the Church have a distinctive contribution to make? Most assuredly it has. It declares on the highest authority that men of every nation and race are brothers, children of the Heavenly Father; that above all nations is humanity; that men and peoples of every land and race have inalienable rights; that justice, fair treatment and goodwill between peoples and races are inescapable obligations, immutable moral laws ordained of God; that their violation is sin and brings terrible disaster and, if persisted in, final destruction.
>
> "It has become clear that *no merely intellectual message,* however cogent, no appeal to the 'enlightened self-interest of mankind,' can establish a warless world. Men's hearts must be changed. There must come into the life of millions of men the spirit of goodwill, of fair play, of justice. Deeds of goodwill and service can alone disarm suspicion and fear. Spiritual disarmament must precede physical disarmament. But in the last resort the question is one of moral progress of the individual men who compass the communities.
>
> "It is at bottom a question of obedience or disobedience to the eternal laws that men should love one another and should bear one another's burdens.
>
> "The Church holds in its hands the keys of life and death. Its work is to create in men and in nations and races that spirit of justice, of brotherliness, of unselfish service, of cooperation. This is *the way of life* for men and for nations, and the only way. This spirit must dominate our nation if the Conference is to reach any large degree of success. To secure this is the distinctive contribution of the Church.
>
> "Have we loved our enemies? Have we been really friendly to our neighbors, to Mexico on the south, and to Japan, that rising oriental power across the Pacific? Or have we had our eyes fixed chiefly on their misdeeds and our consequent losses? How much heed have we paid to our deeds and their losses? And how about our spirit in dealing with them? Our patriotism, moreover, is it narrowly nationalistic? Does our sense of human brotherhood demand for men of other nations and races the same rights and privileges which we desire for ourselves?
>
> "And is it not true that we have sinned not merely as a nation, but also as a Church? Has the Church not left undone things that it ought to have done—in the teaching of brotherliness, goodwill and helpfulness? Have we steadily cultivated the spirit of Christ in our thought of Germans and Russians and Japanese—during recent years? Are the Churches of America even now doing all that they should be doing for abolishing war and in combatting and destroying those teachings and that spirit that create armament and induce war?
>
> "Does the Church of today, like the apostolic Church, through the power of the Spirit, rise above barriers of race and nation? Can the modern Church really fulfill its function in the world and make its true and distinctive and absolutely essential contribution to the establishment of a warless world, unless and until it does beget among its millions of members the mind and the heart of Christ in their relations with other peoples and other races?
>
> "More than all else, there is need for a new spirit in our international life. Penitence there must be, first of all, for our own past sin in thinking too much of our own rights and others' duties, too little of our own duties and others' rights. We must learn to think of our nation not as an end in itself, but as a member of a family of nations under a common Father. All unneighborly attitudes toward other peoples, all prejudice against other races, must be put away. Our hearts must be open to the incoming of the divine spirit of love which alone can bring lasting peace to a world torn by war and staggering under the colossal burden of unnecessary armaments.
>
> "We maintain with firm conviction that it is the right and the duty of the churches to declare in no doubtful terms the moral principles that are involved in international life, and to insist that our law-makers and all those who represent our nation in its international relations, shall observe these principles with utmost care.
>
> "We believe that peculiar duties and responsibilities rest upon Christians in this and all other lands for the establishment of the institutions of peace. It is for Christian pastors and preachers everywhere to teach these truths to the people and through the Grace of God to create that heart and that will in each nation, without which disarmament is only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a beautiful rainbow in the sky and a warless world is impossible."

Let me quote from the ideals set forth by the Federal Council the very moment that our nation entered the war:

"As members of the church of Christ, the hour lays upon us special duties;

"To purge our own hearts clean of arrogance and selfishness;

"To hold our own nation true to its professed aims of justice, liberty, and brotherhood;

"To testify to our fellow Christians in every land, most of all to those from whom for the time we are estranged, our consciousness of unbroken unity in Christ;

"To unite in the fellowship of service, multitudes who love their enemies and are ready to join with them in rebuilding the waste places as soon as peace shall come;

"To be vigilant against every attempt to arouse the spirit of vengeance and unjust suspicion toward those of foreign birth or sympathies;

"To protect the rights of conscience against every attempt to invade them;

"Above all, to call men everywhere to new obedience to the will of our Father God, who in Christ has given himself in supreme self-sacrifice for the redemption of the world, and who invites us to share with him his ministry of reconciliation.

"To such service we would summon our fellow Christians of every name. In this spirit we would dedicate ourselves and all that we have to the nation's cause. With this hope we would join hands with all men of goodwill of every land and race, to rebuild on this war-ridden and desolated earth the commonwealth of mankind, and to make of the kingdoms of the world the kingdom of the Christ."

Does all this "justify lying and hatred"?
Here is the call for the present Easter season:

"The streams of human life can rise no higher than their source. Nations can be redeemed only as mankind is convicted of sin, induced to repentance. National hatreds can only be overcome and human compassion can only be deepened by getting hatred and sin out of the hearts of men and out of our own hearts by the expulsive power of the love of Christ. Our first call is to self-examination and penitence."

Is this not based on authority? If this is not good *teaching,* what is it? Just what would you substitute? If it is not "a way of life," how would you denominate it?

Anyone reading the constructive portions of your editorial might even think that you had come pretty near plagiarizing from these very teaching courses which I sent you. Indeed you use identical phrases.

But, you will say, these are "mere words." So are the best editorials in the New Republic. Well, so indeed are the Ten Commandments, and so is the Sermon on the Mount. Let me assure you that it was not the intention of men who set forth these ideals that they were to be repeated with the mouth, they were intended for that very "teaching process" which you rightly declare is the essential thing needed by the church and by humanity. Undoubtedly, the churches and individual Christians vary in the extent to which they live according to these ideals.

4. I have no apology whatever to offer because bodies representing the churches believe that education in fundamental principles must also be accompanied by some intimation as to the application of these principles in practical affairs. In other words, individual redemption must be related to social obligation and duty. Otherwise, these ideals do remain mere words, or, as you choose to call it, "propaganda." I should suppose the New Republic would be the last place in the world where one should look for discouragement of this process of translating moral principles into social and political terms, both individual and corporate.

In the last analysis, the constructive elements in your editorial are almost identical with the teaching of the Federal Council and the intelligent leaders in its constituency. Your main contention is simply this—that the world has failed to follow this teaching. With this, I am sure, we are all agreed. Whether this is the fault of the teaching, and the teachers, or whether it is due to the hardness of men's hearts, is another question.

Ought you not to estimate the churches by their ideals and idealists rather than by their weakest adherents or by unheeding governments or blind humanity? Even the Sermon on the Mount did not get a large hearing and was not largely practiced. But that was neither the fault of the sermon nor the preacher. I prefer to estimate the New Republic, for example, by your own editorial rather than by the article on religious institutions which was slipped in a while ago by H. L. Mencken.

What you have termed "mere propaganda" is a serious effort to set forth those ideals which must be incorporated into the existing teaching processes of the churches and to do it in concrete and practical form. That churches and their members lag far behind those ideals no one denies, and that the world as a whole and its political institutions have ignored them has been made obvious by these recent tragic years. That they indicate a life to be lived and not a mere creed to be mumbled, would be understood by at least most of your readers.

Had you examined more carefully you would have noted that the material which you characterize hastily as "mere resolutions" had been put into the form of study courses for church classes, for the purpose of doing just what you urge, namely serious *teaching.*

I wonder, my dear friend, how long it is since you have been to church, just where you went the last time and how far you form your judgments from those rather occasional pulpit utterances which the press calls "good news." Suppose you try Fosdick or Merrill, or Gordon when in Boston, or Jefferson, some Sunday. I fear you are a bit behind the times.

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,
General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

New York City.

[Before dealing with the essential difference which Mr. Macfarland's letter brings out between his attitude towards the realization of Christian truth and my own, let us consider for a moment one preliminary issue. He asks the "privilege of specifically denying, in behalf of American churches" certain of my "original assertions,"—the chief erroneous assertion being that "the majority of the Christians, with the majority of the Christian clergy at their head" believe "in the conception of holy wars." If this denial means that the Christian churches have never literally and authoritatively expressed themselves in favor of the conception of holy wars, it is, of course, true. But the surest indication of what people believe is their behavior. The world has just passed through four years of war in which all the major combatants were people who professed the Christian religion. Every one of these people were in their own eyes and according to the official program fighting a "holy war"; and if the Christian churches did not pass resolutions explicitly approving of this interpretation, they certainly allowed the armies of these Christian nations to go to the front, soothed and encouraged by the belief that the Christian God blessed their cause. In a little book entitled The Fight for Peace, written by Mr. Sidney Gulick and published "under the authority f the Churches of Christ in America," Mr. Gulick goes far towards corroborating the New Republic's statement. "The churches of each nation," he writes, "have sent the armies to the front with their benedictions. Each nation, moreover, is praying for victory to the God in whom it professes to believe and whose commands it professes to obey."

Mr. Gulick published the passage we have quoted in 1915 and intended it to apply to the churches of the original combatants, but it was later equally true of the churches in America. If ever religious bodies sent the national armies to the front with a benediction, it was the churches of America in 1917. Early in May of that year the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America called a special Washington meeting in which they declared that while they "abhorred war" and had striven "to secure the judicial settlement of international disputes" they could pledge "support and allegiance in unstinted measure" to this particular war. The American government was entering it with such admirable aims that Christians were justified "in laying down all, even life itself." They bestowed this blessing on the national cause not merely as "American citizens" but as "members of Christian churches." Whether or not this particular war was so holy that it justified Christians in laying down not only their own lives but lives of other people who did not believe in the excellence of American aims, the Federal Council did not say. If by their words Mr. Macfarland and his associates did not declare their allegiance by the clearest possible testimony of conduct to the conception of a "holy war," their words concealed rather than expressed their meaning.

The members of the Council of the Churches of Christ in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America were, as I see it, under no collective obligation as Christians to have opposed American entrance into the war. War was a recognized agency of the society to which they owed allegiance for the accomplishment of political changes which had to be accomplished and which could not under existing conditions be accomplished by any other means. None of the denominations to which the members of the Council belonged had ever officially declared themselves opposed to all war, and they could not have adopted any such declaration without implicitly defying the state. It would be impotent for them to condemn war absolutely unless the nations were ready to adopt effective alternative methods of accomplishing international political readjustments. The members of the Council could as individuals have approved the action of their own government in declaring war on the ground that its action was under existing circumstances the less of two evils, either one of which they had to accept, or they could have disapproved it as the greater of two evils. They could as individual Christians have refused on conscientious grounds to participate either in that particular war or in any war, provided they considered it worth while to defy the state and accept the consequences. But as a body which at the time was more representative of American Protestant Christianity than any other, they could not reasonably profitably invoke religious sanctions either for or against the war.

They could not invoke whatever official authority Christian truth possessed among Christian peoples against the war for one obvious reason. There was nothing unequivocal in the creeds of their denominations, in the practice of Christian peoples or in the moral ideals of their societies which would afford them the necessary leverage for such an action. The churches in America are handmaids of the state and have never seriously claimed a sphere of moral authority which might conceivably conflict with that of the state. Neither are they justified in defying the state until they have obtained and deserved much more influence over popular conduct than that which they now possess. When they wish to mould popular conduct, as in the case of the evils of intemperance, they have to fall back on the power of the state to compel obedience. In the light of the Christian promise of peace on earth and goodwill to men war is an atrocity, but so is the administration of criminal justice by the modern state. In these and many other instances the conditions do not exist under which the Christian ideal of peace and human regeneration can effectively operate, and the way to cure the evil is not to refuse any traffic with the offending institutions, but to study and to learn how society can substitute positive consent for compulsion as the dominant influence in public conduct. But if the Federal Council were not in a position to invoke the authority of Christian truth, as embodied in the evangelical churches, against war, they were still less justified in invoking the authority of the churches in favor of the war. From the point of view of a sincere and intelligent believer in the Christian ideals war could only appear as an atrocity to which he or she might have reluctantly to consent, but on which he had no justification for bestowing a religious benediction. When he consented to a war he should frankly recognize that he was tampering with an unruly political instrument which in its direct and indirect consequence endangered the human values most precious to the Christian spirit.

In May, 1917, the Federal Council exhibited some apprehension of the effects of entering war on the psychology of the American nation. At the same meeting in which the Federal Council as members of the Christian community blessed the war, they issued the statement of ideals which Mr. Macfarland quotes and in reference to which he asks me whether "all this justifies lying and hatred." Does Mr. Macfarland imagine that I criticized the Federal Council for adopting resolutions in favor of lying and hatred? In the passage to which he objects I was pointing out in substance that in so far as the churches blessed a war as holy, the people who were waging it would be tempted to disregard their natural antipathy to such a violation of human values. They would not unreasonably feel themselves more than usually justified in hating their enemies, in prolonging the war to the bitter end and in adopting particularly unscrupulous tactics in waging it. That was certainly the actual result of the general adoption by the American people and their associates in the ar of the conviction that God was fighting on their side. The statement of ideals quoted by Mr. Macfarland and adopted in May, 1917, expresses admirably the reverse of this spirit. It expresses clearly and eloquently the values which a Christian should seek to preserve during war and which Lincoln preserved during the Civil War. But the American people subsequently ignored all of these values and they behaved in this way either with the approval or the connivance of the Christian churches.

The Federal Council solemnly promised "to testify to our fellow Christians in every land, most of all to those from whom for the time being we are estranged, our consciousness of unbroken unity in Christ," "to keep before the eyes of ourselves and of our Allies the ends for which we fight," *"to hold our own nation true** to its professed aims and justice, liberty and brotherhood," *"to be vigilant** against every attempt to arouse the spirit of vengeance and unjust suspicion towards those of foreign birth or sympathies," and *"to protect the rights of conscience** against every attempt to invade them." If the American nation had deliberately planned to disregard this advice from its religious leaders, it would have behaved just as it did. It became completely absorbed in the pursuit of victory at any price, and indulged in an orgy of war intoxication, during which "we hated as our governments bade us hate, and spread lies about our enemies" and ruthlessly suppressed as unclean and dastardly every symptom of conscientious protest. But if the Federal Council actually did anything or said anything to counteract the hatred and lying and "hold the nation true" to the ideals to which they so uncompromisingly declared their allegiance, no such behavior appears in the record. Nor was it either a difficult or a doubtful job. There were others who took their place. The people in all the belligerent countries who incurred unpopularity and suspicion during the war in the attempt to give reality to the Christian ideals, as defined by the Federal Council, were only in rare cases Christian clergymen. They consisted for the most part of men and women associated with the liberal and radical attitude towards social questions. Yet while Christian ideals as declared by the Federal Council were allowed to slumber until the end of the war, there were many conspicuous Christian clergymen who did what they could to increase the prevailing intoxication of war and to interpret the delirium of self-righteous violence as the clearing of "a path for the coming of the kingdom of heaven on earth."

I have devoted a good deal of space to this preliminary question because it illustrates the essential difference between Mr. Macfarland and myself. His letter consists chiefly of quotations from official statements issued at one time or another by the Federal Council, in which Christianity is interpreted among other things as a way of life. These quotations would in his opinion justify a reader in thinking that in writing my own article I "had come pretty near plagiarizing" from these very teaching courses. But I never argued that the better teachers of Christianity did not talk and write about it as a way of life. I only asserted that inasmuch as Christianity was a way of life, the Christian clergy were not sufficiently united and thoroughgoing in giving vitality to this interpretation and did not know enough about human nature and social processes actually to mould individual and social life in the light of Christian truth. In spite of their express desire to realize Christianity in life, they cling to the conception of religious truth as something which is to be transmitted chiefly in writing and sermons. When they are criticized for the failure to embody Christianity in conduct, they always refer the critic to something some of them have said.

Mr. Macfarland anticipates this comment, but he does not answer it. If the resolutions of the Federal Council are, he says, "mere words," so are the editorials in the New Republic, the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. But the New Republic is frankly "a journal of opinion." Its purpose is to arouse its editors and readers into thinking candidly and progressively about public questions. It is an agency for the discussion of secular ideas and political and social problems. It does not pretend to speak for a community of the elect or to demonstrate to a suffering and a deluded generation the way to live if it is to be saved. The most precious part of Christianity is, as I am sure Mr. Macfarland would agree, not the Sermon on the Mount or the Ten Commandments. It is the dramatic unity of the personality, the sayings, the life, death and the subsequent resurrection of Christ. The interpretation of His death as a vicarious atonement for the sins of mankind and of His resurrection in the spirit of His faithful followers as a call to live again in His image—this symbol of the conflict in the human spirit and the way of overcoming it have exercised, and will, I believe, continue to exercise an irresistible fascination

*Italics ours.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the religious imagination of both simple ad sophisticated people.

The problem of the Christian evangelist has always been that of infecting unprepared minds with the unique value which he imputes to the life and death of Jesus and its interpretation as a dramatic symbol of the redemption of man. He has had to depend finally for his means of edification upon the conception of knowledge in relation to reality which prevailed in his own day. The miracle of the Eucharist provided the mechanism of transmission as long as scholastic realism determined the prevailing conception of truth. After scholastic realism ceased to supply an authoritative theory of knowledge, dissent from the authority of the Catholic Church as the only medium of salvation became inevitable. Protestantism was associated with a subjectivism and nominalism which accounts both for its emphasis on internal states of mind, its dependence on exhortation as the means of objectifying its ideals and for the excessive function in religious education which Protestant Christianity has asked words to accomplish. In our own day experimental science furnishes the vital conception of reality. Science consists primarily in descriptions of natural processes which are subsequently verified in experience. It presupposes inexhaustible possibilities of improvement in the truth of the description. In order to explore these possibilities, it uses words to formulate hypotheses. In exploring the possibilities of human nature whose destiny is the common interest of science and religion, the function of words is no doubt peculiarly important. The ability of human beings to develop the possibilities of human nature depends largely on their theories about themselves and their emotional attitude towards themselves. Words are indispensable for the formulation of these theories and the transmission of these attitudes. They are particularly powerful as agents of repression. There is no surer way of condemning human nature to depravity than by believing it depraved and by shouting the belief from the pulpit. Human beings cannot become free and regenerate unless they believe in regeneracy as a possibility of their own nature; and the subsequent verification of this belief will depend in part on the contagious use of words or on symbolic appeals to the imagination which need words for their expression. But indispensable as ideal symbolic verbal preparation for the unfolding of human nature is, it is only introductory. The essential business is the subsequent realization in conduct of these superlative hypotheses—the creation by Christian education of men and women who know how to incarnate in their own lives some of the unfulfilled possibilities of human nature.

Christian education in the sense of Christian evangelism has in times past enabled the faithful to express in their conduct unfulfilled possibilities of human nature; but the successes of Christian evangelism were interpreted as miracles of grace and were associated with a belief in magic. No doubt a belief in the miraculous possibilities of human nature may help to create exceptional and intense states of mind; and these states of mind will provide the wings for flights of moral conduct which may look like miracles of human regeneration. Nevertheless a belief in magic is an insuperable obstacle to a solid scientific description of natural processes; and as long as Christians believe in human regeneration as the result of the repetition and circulation of morally magical phrases, they will never obtain a serviceable knowledge of the way in which to unfold the undeveloped possibilities of human nature. The illusion of Christian evangelists that they could invoke miracles of human redemption has blinded them to the need of finding out how they could transform human nature, miraculously or otherwise. It has inhibited them from learning how to translate Christianity as a group of symbols and beliefs into Christianity as an objective, verifiable way of life. What Christian evangelists need in order to give reality to Christianity as a way of life is an adaptation to their own purpose of the methods of experimental science.

The world (the nominally Christian world) has, as Mr. Macfarland says, failed to live according to the Christian teaching. He seems to attribute the failure to the "hardness of men's hearts." Well, the hearts of men are hard particularly when their habits of behavior and their thinking are modified by their economic interests; and the problem of overcoming this hardness of heart is enormously and staggeringly difficult. But I do not think that Christianity has ever sufficiently qualified itself to undertake the work. For men's heads are hard as well as their hearts; and a religious educational society whose teaching has appealed so feebly to hard-headed men has lacked the only adequate retort to the prevailing hardness of heart. It seems reasonable to attribute the failure of Christians to live according to the Christian teaching not to their hard hearts or to their soft hearts but to some radical defect in the teaching itself—a defect which originated in the inability of the Christian clergy to understand what they had to gain by domesticating in the universe of Christian education an active living experimental method which would relieve religious education of its bondage to words and subjective attitudes.

This bondage to words and subjective states of mind reaches its consummate expression in Christian Science—a fact which leads to a significant paradox. The creed of the sect totally disavows naturalism and identifies Christian knowledge with the disavowal. Yet the very completeness of the break imposes on Christian Scientists the necessity of vindicating their vision of the truth in practice. Their creed is meaningless unless they apply it to life, and their honest attempt to apply it bestows a kind of reality even on their illusions. A paradox such as this is symptomatic both of the ambiguity for Christians of Christian truth and the need of overcoming that ambiguity not by controversy but by demonstrating what an applied Christianity which was really scientific can accomplish for human regeneration. I do not see how Christianity can become the healing and binding influence which good Christians like Mr. Macfarland wish it to become and which in my opinion it is capable of becoming until it heals these radical differences of opinion about its meaning; and I do not see how it can heal its dissensions until it abandons the obsolete approach to truth, which it has inherited from a pre-scientific age and modifies its creeds, its moral outlook, its conception of religious education in the light not merely of the results but of the methods of modern science.

There was a time when the function of teaching in a Christian society belonged exclusively to the church. The Catholic Church still insists upon the associating of ordinary education with the teaching of religious truth. Until recently the education and particularly the higher education which the young people even in Protestant communities received frequently came from clergymen. The American colleges were originally denominational and to this day there is, I believe, a theory that there is something Baptist about the kind of education which is imparted at the University of Chicago, something Presbyterian about Princeton and something Congregational about Yale. But in the meantime modern education has become in practice completely secularized and this fact is in itself a sufficient demonstration of the failure of the Christian clergy of today as teachers. They do not possess the knowledge which the citizens of a modern industrial society need. They do not possess the authority which enables them to infuse into individual and social life that part of the truth which their Master revealed to them. They cannot win the needed authority and resume their function as teachers of mankind by virtue of exhortation from the pulpit or by collective propaganda. They can win it only by demonstrating to themselves and to an increasingly pagan world their ability to verify the great experiment in regenerate human life which Christianity calls for and which the rapidly increasing knowledge of what human nature is and how it operates is forcing on the conscience of mankind.—H. C.]

A Social Science Group

SIR: A group of young men and women—students and workers in the field of Social Science—are interested in the interchange of views and the discussion of sociological problems in an informal way, and for this purpose have formed an organized body. This aims to provide an intelligent and understanding circle of listeners for individuals desiring to express themselves in a more intimate atmosphere and in a less limited fashion than is permitted by the usual formal after-lecture discussion period.

Meetings are conducted regularly, and at each meeting opportunity is afforded for the reading of a prepared paper or the delivery of a prepared talk by a member of the group.

New members are invited. Address

Secretary,
1041 Trinity Ave.,
New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Landlubbers on Foreign Seas

The History and Nature of International Relations. Edited by Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.25.

Near Eastern Affairs, by Stephen Panaretoff. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.25.

The Struggle for Power in Europe, 1917-21, by L. Haden Guest. New York: G. H. Doran Co. $4.50.

Russia's Foreign Relations during the Last Half Century, by Baron S. A. Korff. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.25.

Russia in the Far East, by Leo Pasvolsky. New York: The Macmillan Co. $1.50.

The Conduct of American Foreign Relations, by John Mabry Mathews. New York: The Century Company. $3.00.

Secret Diplomacy, by Paul S. Reinsch. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. $2.00.

An American Diplomat in China, by Paul S. Reinsch. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company. $4.00.

Diplomacy: Old and New, by George Young. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. $1.00.

After the War, by Colonel Repington. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co. $5.00.

"THE Pacific had its menaces, and they deeply concerned us," said President Harding to the public in his address to the Senate on February 9, 1922. We have just passed through one great crisis and still more solemn days approach. It is well to be prepared. So books on foreign relations stream from the press. Under the editorship of Dr. Walsh appears a collection of papers mainly by eminent American professors who skirt ingeniously along the shores of academic unreality saying many appropriate things about many matters from the wars of the Hittites to Latin American ideals without really touching such a substance as iron, coal, gold, rubber, or oil or even the fundamental diplomatic revelations of the past five years. "The truce of God" and that "prince of jurists," John Marshall, are here, but in spite of Professor Laughlin's statement that foreign relations are probably eight-tenths economics (p. 133), this book is about ninety-nine one-hundreths formality and ancient history.

Nobody expected anything from the men of affairs who took part in the Williams College Institute of Politics. Such men never tell the important and vital things they know about diplomacy or politics, but content themselves with pleasing generalities or with historical disquisitions culled from encyclopaedias by their secretaries. The Honorable Stephen Panaretoff's book on Near Eastern affairs is trite beyond imagination. There are thirty pages on the church and literature, dry, gray, and irrelevant. There is a chapter on Political Progress hot from the Encyclopaedia Britannica and the Statesman's Year Book. As for Stamboulisky and the Green International, there is not a breath in these chaste pages. For anything as real as that one will have to consult Mr. Guest's informing book, which though a bit optimistic in tone, is full of facts about the economic life of eastern Europe—indeed an important work.

Baron Korff has risen to the great heights attained by Mr. Panaretoff. Occasionally he almost touches the fringe of reality. He even mentions the "brilliant" work of Kautsky and Professor Fay, but he ignores more important materials that were available when he gave his lectures, materials which make his story of questionable value, where it is not merely ancient history or homily. When Baron Korff becomes oracular, he is frequently quite inadequate. Take one example. On page 12 he says that the Belgian agents according to the documents published by Schwertfeger (Vol. V) "unanimously state . . . that Russia during this period was standing for permanent peace, etc." He certainly never read Chapter II of the Introduction, entitled Der Panslawismus (1885-89), and the supporting Anlagen. If he should do so, he will find the matter not so simple. Baron Korff is surely joking when, on page 52, he says that "neither the British nor the French government realized sufficiently that they were backing autocracy and not the Russian people." He should read his own page 13, picturing Republican France persecuting Russian exiles. When he tells us that Sir Edward Grey is above suspicion and "one of the greatest idealists of our days" and we then turn to the documents in Siebert and Schreiner, Entente Diplomacy and the World, pp. 709-734, to Numbers 3, 5, 6, and 20 of Die Deutschen Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch and to Pokrovski's articles published in Pravda during February and March, 1919, we are moved to proclaim Baron Korff the greatest master of diplomacy since Baron Munchausen. He is even innocent enough to imply that the Russo-Japanese treaty of 1916 had reference to war against Germany rather than war against the United States (or, very improbably, Great Britain). On this point he should read pages 47-50 of Pasvolsky's work on Russia and the Far East—a real contribution to diplomacy and politics. Professor Mathews' book on the conduct of foreign relations is intended for professors and lawyers and is well done. It is systematic, documented, and accurate. It covers all such formal matters as the Department of State, diplomatic intercourse, the consular service, treaty-making, and measures preliminary to war—in their outward and ceremonial aspects. Professor Mathews has done admirably what he has set out to do. It is no fault of his if no American citizen can learn anything vital about diplomacy from his pages. Let anyone compare this excellent treatise with a work like Rives' book on our Mexican relations and he will discover the difference between the ritualistic aspects of politics and the substance thereof.

A little more near to reality is Dr. Reinsch's record of his service as an American diplomat in China or rather that part of his record which he sees fit to publish. It is delightfully written and will be read with zest by people in the reminiscent stage. The reviewer cannot refrain from comparing Dr. Reinsch as a Georgetown University lecturer with Dr. Reinsch's full length portrait drawn by himself. In the former capacity, speaking of China's severing diplomatic relations with Germany, Dr. Reinsch says: "There were no demands, promises, or urgent representations, there was no haggling about advantages to be obtained. After a brief but careful consideration of the proposal of the United States, it was accepted by the free act of the Chinese government." This and then Chapter XXI of his memoirs. In the latter, Dr. Reinsch describes the considerable negotiations required to fetch China into the fold and shows himself rather active in bringing the reluctant Chinese to terms. He also tells how others were "tireless working in their own way with men whose confidence they enjoyed" and "urging" the policy proposed by America. Strictly speaking, there may have been no promises, but anyone not a casuist would take Dr. Reinsch's assurances—printed on page 252 of his book—as statements very much like promises. Moreover, Dr. Reinsch (p. 245) tells us that Mr. Sam Blythe was among the men who helped him bring China into the fray. Now Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Blythe in another place has shown us the "urgent Americans" and others, "urging, forcing, begging, cajoling, and showing the Chinese." Mr. Blythe also pictures Dr. Reinsch working like a galley slave on the job. It would look as if our former ambassador had got his wires crossed and would have to get out a revised version of one of his accounts.

This incident throws great light on the arts of secret diplomacy which Dr. Reinsch vigorously damns in his valuable work of that subject, a work full of illustrations from the book of Sazonov, Poincaré, and Sir Edward Grey. This incident will also illuminate the cynicism which Dr. Reinsch regrets to find expressed by European diplomats when they hear Americans talk about their "idealism." For the disease of secret diplomacy Dr. Reinsch prescribes publicity for all treaties and the creation of an informed public opinion. This leaves unsolved only one minor problem: "How is the public to get the inside information which alone can permit the creation of a sound opinion?" If Dr. Reinsch would answer that query, he would render a very great service. Mr. Young has made a contribution to this subject in his suggestions for reform in the English diplomatic service and parliamentary procedure, but it is a slight one. He thinks that the establishment of a Department of Foreign Affairs in London University would work for the effective realization of international ideals. Probably it would—about as effectively as the Roosevelt-Wilhelm II exchange professorships.

Colonel Charles à Court Repington, who, by the way, came nearer guessing right than the Oxford dons in the pre-historic age before the war, fain would contribute to our enlightenment and to his purse by writing a book on his travels and gossip in France, Austria, Italy, Greece, Rumania, and Bulgaria—with an appendix on the Washington Conference. It is needless to say that it makes racy reading. We are told about many things. The German budget is not balanced, Lady Clerk "is a very pretty woman with a fine figure" (p. 125), a demi-mondaine in Vienna is sorry that she has to give up her old friends for the profiteers because she cannot lower her standard of living (p. 151), modern dancing is awfully vulgar, and Admiral Sims is for freedom of the seas if it means mixed bathing. If some unlucky wight from Omaha should leave his native town and visit many people and write intimate comments about those who wined and dined him, New York City would denounce him as a horrible vulgar wretch. When Mrs. Asquith and Colonel Repington do it, New Yorkers cheer and pay five dollars for the privilege of being on the inside. Will no Erasmus come soon to do justice to them that sit in moonshine?

CHARLES A. BEARD.

Jack London

The Book of Jack London, by Charmian London. 2 vols.; illustrated with photographs. New York: Century Co. $10.00.

IN Martin Eden and John Barleycorn, Jack London wrote the expurgated story of his career. There are supplementary hints and allusions, also expurgated, in other tales, such as the Valley of the Moon. What remains to be told of London's life is highly interesting to the detached observer: but it produces the shock of discovering that the missing arm on our marble deity is a wooden one.

An appraisal of Jack London's life must be prefaced with a tribute to Charmian London's honesty: in spite of her abysmal reverence for her departed mate, she leaves us with a feeling that is little less than repulsion. Her hero, if not a Chocolate Soldier, turns out to be a Gingerbread Superman.

About the career of Jack London there is a vague and yet definitive myth which will probably prove more durable than the canonical accounts of his existence. We picture him first as a waif of the San Francisco waterside, penniless, homeless, without friends. He becomes the member of a gang of oyster-pirates. He goes to sea and suffers incredible hardships. He returns to land and continues to suffer incredible hardships. He is driven to vagrancy. At last, by heroic resistance, London lifts himself out of his lowly ways, and in a lonely garret starts to hammer out a philosophy and a literature. Inhumanly rebuffed by a clique of editors, London nevertheless becomes successful; and under the lash of Mr. Hearst, he suffers the final hardship of complete frustration.

The reality is as much like this myth as the drab presentation of a movie melodrama is like the three-colored lithographs that hang outside the entrance of the theatre; and yet in the reality there is a deeper tragedy—the tragedy of the minor creative artist—which the myth doesn't even touch.

Jack London, contrary to the myth, was equipped from the beginning with the usual complement of parents, with a home, with friends, and with a limited but nevertheless certain share of bed and board. So far from being a waif of the water front, he was able to borrow from his old colored nurse the three hundred dollars that made him the master of a trim fishing sloop; and if he did not plod his way through high school and college, it was chiefly an innate restlessness, a lust for adventure, and a scarcely juvenile will-to-power that kept him from being chained to the humdrum and the obvious. Untutored in the academic sense of the word, London's life was far from being mentally impoverished. Perhaps the only real injury that resulted from his being kept away from books up to the age of eighteen years was that it created in him an almost superstitious reverence for the printed word.

London's life, however, was not one long flare of "burning daylight." It is perhaps a little hard to realize that his career can be cut abruptly into two parts. The first part, which carried him through adolescence, contained adventure and variety; to this period belong the oyster-pirating, the fish patrol, the sealing cruise, the cramming for college, the long ordeal of the road, and the rush for the Klondike. What is loveable and attractive in London seems to remain over from this period. In the second part of his life London hardened into a self-conscious, aggressive, dogmatic "economic man;" this whole phase was devoted to the "game" of literature; and whatever romance it may have contained—like the Cruise of the Snark—was a by-product of his restless search for copy.

If the younger London was unconsciously a Stevensonian swaggerer, the older man was a disciple of Kipling. In the first phase, London is a picturesque pirate, gaily embracing the slattern, Adventure; in the second he is a sleek and consciously virtuous missionary, for whom adventure is a "white man's" diet that must be swallowed at any hazard. In short, London turned out to be a red-blooded prig.

The maturer phase of London's life should not be examined by his personal admirers; indeed, it is painful even for those who are not his admirers. Very early in that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

period London harnessed himself to three taskmasters: a wife, a typewriter, and a magazine. Gaining manhood, Jack seems to have lost many of the manly virtues; and his loud cries for virility, strength, blood-courage, and the like we must look upon simply as neurotic attempts to compensate for an incomplete and tepid existence. Not that there was no genuine alternative other than inane domesticity or physical adventure. Whilst London was molding his career there was a time when he had a definite choice between the creative life and the pecuniary struggle. For a while he was fortunate enough to have the friendship of Anna Strunsky, a girl who held before him the ideal of a humane life; and we gather he was made so uneasy by her friendship that he turned his back on it by a hasty marriage to his first wife, a nonentity.

"As for Anna," Charmian London says, "the very dart and smart of their intellectual comradery rendered her an unrest. His plans for the future were so nicely ordered toward a systematic schedule of writing—to the aim of successful living, to be sure—that he could not consider the feverish temperamental life that was likely to be if he joined his with Anna's." Alas for the artist in Jack London, his primitive will-to-power got swiftly dammed up in a middle class will-to-comfort; and Anna was lost. Mr. Hearst is not to blame for this initial capitulation: in acquiring "bourgeois" culture London had acquired the pecuniary ideals which make that culture peaked and ridiculous—a perpetual poor-relative at Dives' table. Jack London's chief weakness was that he thought it worth while to become One of Our Conquerors.

"A man without courage," London once wrote, "is to me the most despicable thing under the sun, a travesty of the whole scheme of creation." In the midst of the orgiastic agriculture of his Valley of the Moon, did Jack London come to realize that he, the artist, had been essentially a man without courage? If he did, the explanation of his death at the age of forty, from a disease aggravated by his persistent excesses in food and drink, is no longer a mystery. His end was suicide.

One cannot help thinking that the strenuous activities of London's successful years were a continual running away from himself. What was the self from which he ran away? It was the self of an artist; a minor artist, to be sure, but a real one, an artist who might rank with Gissing or Reade. In Martin Eden that self still speaks pretty loudly; and it speaks with conviction. Jack London had the choice between killing the artist in him, and shuffling out of the habits that threatened to kill the artist. Must we not see in Martin Eden's self-extinction—a tense and convincing end—the early expression of an unconscious wish?

In real life, Jack grasped the first alternative. With the writing of Martin Eden, London's growth came to a full stop; and the weeds and tares of a misdirected creative life began to fill the arable patches of his mind. After this point, we are concerned only with the failure of the man: the possibilities of the artist were over. Thenceforth, beneath his robust assurance of himself, beneath his contempt for people who put financial success on a lower plane than artistic merit, one reads the story of his disintegration. London's multitudinous activities were regressive; he relapsed into mudpies. The Snark was one mudpie; and the ranch another; and the great house a third.

It is a painful task to watch London's collapse; to see how, when he had failed to dominate himself, he worked out his will-to-power upon his "inferiors." From the moment London's stories are successful, he abandons all manual work, even in the form of play; he cultivates a Korean valet; he secretly desires the nickname, "Wolf;" he undertakes scientific agriculture on a vast scale and at his death has a gang of fifty men working for him, with half of whom, perhaps, he had never spoken. To give other people orders and watch them jump—this seems in the end to have become London's ruling ambition. It was scarcely a mature ambition. Pampered children succumb to it in the nursery.

In explaining London's disintegration and failure the pen inevitably becomes soft: one is touched by London's life, as by a perverted innocence. Alas! for the self-made man: so far from rising above his environment, he is the victim of a much narrower milieu, as a rule, than the man who has been open to the influences of a family, a school, a church, a university. The tragedy of the self-made man is that the self he conceived is necessarily as small as the self who conceives it—the very fact that the child is father to the man gives to his maturity the child's limitations. Except for Anna Strunsky, never once does London appear to have come under a single, energetic, corrective influence. Is it any wonder that he could write to Cloudesley Johns (1899):

"Spencer's First Principles alone, leaving out all the rest of his work, has done more for mankind, and through the ages will have done far more for mankind than a thousand books like Nicholas Nickleby, Hard Cash, Book of Snobs, and Uncle Tom's Cabin. Why, take the enormous power for human good contained in Darwin's Origin of Species and Descent of Man. . . ."

Whatever grand effect these works may have had upon mankind, it is altogether plain that they were an unmitigated damage to Jack London; for they enabled him to rationalize his inferiority complex as Anglo-Saxonism, to encourage his slavish attempt to win the pecuniary favors of the big magazines as "the survival of the fittest," and to sublimate his sadistic tendencies into a love for the White Man's burden. From first to last, Jack London's philosophy and science is a superstitious rigmarole, projected by instinctive needs—a barrier to clear thought or sensitive appreciation. Dickens might have taught London that Bounderby, the self-made Economic Man, was a clown; Herbert Spencer seems to have taught him that he was a hero.

In the world of science there was no place for the artist; and no one was at hand to tell London that the artist must create a fresh world out of the chaos within it. In other words, science left London without values; and London found that a world without values was meaningless. Had he been under the influence of a mellower culture—indeed, under the discipline of any culture—he would have discovered that the essential task of the artist was to beget a new world and people it. Instead, London put off the horrors of creative pregnancy in order to play the sedulous prostitute; only to discover at last, I believe, that a landscape full of eucalyptus trees and finely bred cattle was still, humanly speaking, just as empty of values as it had been before his exertions. The failure to realize new values killed the artist; the recognition of this failure possibly killed the man.

A final word remains to be said about the biography itself. It is perhaps one of the best, and one of the very worst examples of the art that has come out of America during the last decade. To Mrs. Charmian London's everlasting credit, she has told her story with sufficient frankness about the latent sides of London's life—his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sexual adventures, for example—to enable us to appraise him as a complete human being. More than that; she has painted a portrait which, despite her love and admiration, is little less than surgical in its exposures. These two volumes, however, might have been shortened by half if Mrs. London's tropical locutions had been put into simple English: her tortuous adjectives and her hectic panegyrics do not make the work easy reading. Had she been able to write clear, coherent prose, this titanic weakling might have lived in the memory of men as a sort of American Casanova. It is his misfortune that he must stand or fall by his own work.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

Five Novels

Beggar's Gold, by Ernest Poole. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.00.

Roads Going South, by Robert L. Duffus. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.00.

Autumn, by Robert Nathan. New York: Robert M. McBride Co. $1.75.

The Answerer, by Grant Overton. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. $2.00.

Where the Pavement Ends, by John Russell. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.

AMONG the chief flaws in American fiction appear to be inconclusive gestures, bad mixture and a weakness for the easiest way out of the problem. Mr. Ernest Poole's Beggar's Gold, for instance, arouses certain expectations which are quickly shattered. The idea is simple enough. Peter Wells is a school-teacher who marries Katherine Blake, another teacher, who has been brought up in China. The life-dream of this couple is to go to China, but always, at the last minute, crop up economic problems that hold them back. It is easy enough to believe that Mr. Poole intended a symbolism in this, that China is the desire that is never quite granted, that marriage is a coil from which the man who dreams of freedom never can quite extricate himself, but the book fails because of a sketchiness of drawing and a general lack of interest. Moon Chao, the little Celestial, strikes the one exotic note in the story and he is apt to be the only personality that the reader will carry away with him. If Mr. Poole had deliberately set himself to do what the book at certain times suggests—a study of the individual in the school system of a great city, he might have made a more serious contribution to American letters. As it is his dexterity of handling has not saved a theme that is decidedly inchoate.

In Mr. Robert L. Duffus' Roads Going South, on the other hand, we have a novel rich enough in material but lacking in technical dexterity. It is a sound book with undoubted moments; the presentation of a career that is at conflict with itself. The action is laid in a small New England town and it will be perceptible to those readers who know such localities that Mr. Duffus has made a painstaking study of the New England type. There is an uprightness, a sense of duty in the typical New Englander that, by exaggeration, has afforded much amusement for certain writers. This type does not interest Mr. Duffus. He is serious, ever so serious—as most young men are. His Joe Chapin is flung hither and thither by two strains of blood that are within him, one from his mother and the other from his father. Both of them are New England strains and it is the working out of these warring heritages and their eventual harmonizing that forms the backbone of the book. Quite the best part of the novel is that describing the childhood, youth and young manhood of Joe Chapin, for it affords opportunity for a very readable picture of contemporary manners in New England.

And now for a book in which both substance and delicate technique are well joined. Mr. Robert Nathan's Autumn may be dubbed either an idyl or a pastoral. There is no orchestration here, but a rather quiet, yet poignant melody played on the violin. The hand of the poet betrays itself unmistakably time and again. The difficulty of describing the book rests in the fact that its charm is intangible. I might say that it is the simple story of an old schoolmaster in a New England village, that the action is extremely faint, that everything is based on the almost fragile characterization of Mr. Jeminy, but that would really be getting nowhere. One must turn to comparisons and mention Flaubert's Un Coeur Simple and certain scenes in Louis Hémon's Maria Chapdelaine and, perhaps, it will be understood what manner of work is in Autumn. Perhaps the one obvious note in this serene and wistful book is the nomenclature of the characters. Mr. Jeminy and Mrs. Grumble and Mrs. Barly are, in a sense, a bit Dickensian but there is no particular reason why an author should not suggest character through names. Mr. Nathan has limited himself in material to a small group in a small place who do nothing extraordinary but he has expended himself thoroughly upon this subject-matter and so delicately adjusted the values of his book that life itself is suggested. It is a small novel but it is a novel of overtones, the book of a poet, simple, quaint, and lovely.

Turning to The Answerer, by Mr. Grant Overton, we are face to face with an ambitious proceeding that is a failure because of two causes—bad writing and bad construction. The novel, fictionally of course, purports to give the story of the early years of Walt Whitman, those years passed on Long Island, the uncertain and unauthenticated love affair in New Orleans, and the Civil War activities. Several historical characters, Abraham Lincoln, Margaret Fuller, Horace Greeley and Herman Melville, for instance, are introduced into the narrative. It is quite futile to attempt to be pick out historical flaws in the book because the author admits taking large liberties in a prefatory statement. Therefore there is nothing to do but to consider it as a novel and, as such, it does not hold up at all. It is loosely constructed—being almost picaresque in form although not picareque in matter—and the author overwrites considerably.

And, so, as Mr. Pepys would say, to another book, in which there will be found over-writing but a conscious over-writing, every line of which aims toward drama and sometimes melodrama. Mr. John Russell's Where the Pavement Ends appeared some seasons ago under the title of The Red Mark. It was not a success and fell by the wayside. Since then the book has scored a considerable hit in England, whereupon the publisher has reissued the volume in this country under its English title, changing the order of the stories. Mr. Russell is neither Joseph Conrad nor Rudyard Kipling, but there are moments in these fourteen short stories when the ghost of one or the other of those English writers may be dimly seen in the offing. Most of the tales are violent in action, treating of the South Seas and Eastern lands, and it may straightway be admitted that Mr. Russell spins a capital yarn, although he seldom stops for any particular literary skill wherewith to clothe it. He is not by any means a great writer nor are any of the tales in this book of an enduring order. They are too brittle for that. The snap at the end is too obvious.

HERBERT S. GORMAN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Psychiatrists, To the Rescue!

Human Behavior In Relation to the Study of Educational, Social and Ethical Problems, by Stewart Paton, M. D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $6.00.

DR. PATON'S is another of the books which are serving to shift the discussion of the mind and motives of man from the speculative and myth making psychologizing of the psycho-analysts to the hardly less inferential but certainly more verifiable analyses of the biologists and neurologists. This shift had been prefigured, but never undertaken, by Freud himself; it had been undertaken, and accomplished, with a beautiful and lucid economy, by Edwin Holt in his Freudian Wish; it had been explicit in Watson's Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist, and it had been advanced by the work of Kempf, Rivers and Tansley. However, neither Freud's animadversions nor Holt's achievement appear to have exercised any influence on the trend and elaboration of the "new" psychology, and the books of the other men, except Watson's, are as yet symptoms rather than influences. The psycho-analytic procedure was and remains, for layman and professional alike, too facile, too seductive, too rich in the gratifications and liberties of adventurous reverie, to face a rival in "bioneurology." The laborious minutiae of the latter, its complicated technique and forbidding terminology compose a handicap which it can have little chance to overcome.

Dr. Paton's book does not, unhappily, improve this chance. His thesis is simple enough, and within the limitations imposed by the subject-matter, is quite capable of clear and elegant statement, and interesting exposition. Dr. Paton has in his turn become passionate about the Socratic program: "Know thyself." He is eager that we should all be about it, and he thinks that if we can realize it in time, it will yet save us. But he does not apprehend this self that we are to know for our safety's sake, either in the manner of Socrates or in the manner of Freud. He apprehends it as a physiological arrangement of nerves and muscles engaged in maintaining an unstable equilibrium in an environment which is always upsetting this equilibrium. Its life consists in "processes of adaptation which have as their object the restoration of the physiological balance of the organism, its protection against injurious forces and the perpetuation of the species." The phenomena in which these processes express themselves are apperceived, not literally and empirically, as they appear, but in terms of a mechanistic materialism, mystically assumed, but no more applicable than any other metaphysical assumption. The body is regarded as a system of energies, whatever that may mean; the brain, as "the centre of a great system for the reception, coordination, transformation, and distribution of energy." In these operations upon energy, having for non-teleological object the preservation of the individual as a "physiological balance" and the "perpetuation of the species," certain mechanisms of adjustment are engaged, involving memory, plasticity, the nervous system, the unconscious, in a process of biological integration in which human life consists. Particularly engaged are the spinal cord and the brain, the "new brain" and the "old" and the system of glands with their internal secretions. In the latter reside the secrets of temperament and character; in the "new brain" the secret of intelligence. It constitutes a secondary system "with the prime function of facilitating full and free expression of the deep-seated instinctive life." Nevertheless, in it consists "the superiority of man"; it displaces "necessary reactions by educable adaptations"; it is the basis of the personality, and it may often be in conflict with the lower levels of the nervous system.

Personality is "the functional expression of the higher brain centres," an "organismal" (sic) conception, compounded of intelligence and character, extrovert or introvert in type, united to the environment by its sense-impressions (which are as important as its instincts), and realizing its integration or balance as health, and its disintegration or repression by "a sense of inadequacy or insecurity" which it seeks to neutralize by cynicism, vanity and other excesses of character. Finally, personality is, we are told, not a state but a process. Of what, and how, is not said, nor is the process of personality described. On the contrary, we are introduced to mechanisms, structures, entities, and told that they operate, but neither the operation nor the manner of it is revealed, nor can be, yet. Descriptions are all of static things in static terms, as when the self or "psychological individual" is stated to be, (the italics are mine) "a *mosaic* of bodily feelings, impulses, tastes and all activities expressed in the life of man . . . a *sum* of memories, or engrams, habit reactions, and representations. . . ." So again, the development of this self from infancy is designated by its imputed conditions rather than by its intrinsic character; so are the formation of types of human temperament and character, the rise and operation of inhibitory processes, the establishment and activity of human dispositions, the formation of habits, of conflicts and dissociations. And, ultimately, all are phenomena of the storing, transformation and redistribution of energy.

This whole ignoratio is perpetrated, moreover, with an extraordinary redundancy and abstractness. The pages bristle with footnotes, and the impression grows on the reader that what they offer has not come as a result of direct observation and reflection but rather as the somewhat careless transcription of reading notes made from cards not too wisely arranged. Both style and form improve, although the content deteriorates, where Dr. Paton begins to express his own likes and dislikes, and moralizes about old age and women's rights, about mysticism and democracy, about colleges and culture, about rebellious artists and pacifists, about progress and revolution, about the German mind and the Russian Soviet Republic. The moralizing contains many items of smart observation and not unsound judgment as well as undisciplined prejudice. The upshot of it is that the world is sick and tired and needs to be reorganized according to the Newark plan, with plenty of jobs for the psychiatrist. Dr. Paton declares:

> Today, although we are aware that there is little to choose between the psychopathic war lord and the equally obsessed, fickle, ambitious leader of the people, we show a strange indifference to the menace of all that both embody. A Soviet régime has glorified egotism, has accepted the Teutonic belief in one road only to salvation; and such clamorous professors of hate toward all forms of autocracy are now proclaiming the supreme right of labor and the common people. Neither autocrat nor Soviet is capable of making any sacrifice for a really disinterested ideal. Neither has recognized the vital principle of mental hygiene that 'civilization does not consist in knowing, but in the manner of acting.' Trotsky and Lenine have put forth a programme which, if carried into effect throughout the world, would make it impossible either to distinguish sanity from insanity or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among Important New Dutton Publications

International Finance and Its Reorganization

By ELISHA M. FRIEDMAN, Author of *"International Commerce and Reconstruction."*

A thorough, judicial and informed survey of the problems of international finance as affected by the war and the resulting conditions. This very important volume should be in the hands of every man who desires to follow understandingly the deliberations of the Genoa Conference or any other discussion of these problems by those hoping for early readjustment. Among its chapters is one entitled *The Inter-Allied Debts—Shall they be Cancelled?* This is an impartial and moderate presentation which marshalls the facts, points out the difference between the present debts and the debts after the Napoleonic wars, traces the history of the proposals for the cancellation of the inter-allied debts, sets forth the conditions under which these debts might be modified, but opposes unconditional cancellation. $7.00

Send for a circular giving a fuller account of this valuable book

Mathematical Philosophy

By CASSIUS J. KEYSER, Adrain Professor of Mathematics, Columbia University.

"A study of Fate and Freedom" which demonstrates the tremendous fundamental need for the spirit of rigorous mathematical thinking in any consideration of education, philosophy, the science of human welfare and thought in general. Its aim is to give meditative, thoughtful readers an understanding of the *pillar-ideas* in mathematics and a sense of their significance in Human Life. It is a book of basic interest to students of mathematics, of philosophy, of natural science and of psychology; and also to sociologists, engineers, critics and all who desire to think constructively of life. $4.70

Send for a circular containing an indication of the contents of this interesting book

The Modern City and Its Government

By WILLIAM PARR CAPES, Secretary, New York State Conference of Mayors and Other City Officials; Director, New York State Bureau of Municipal Information; Co-author of *"Municipal Housecleaning."*

The author writes from long-continued observations during a comprehensive study of the government of American cities of the West and East, and in continual contact with their city officials for the last fifteen years. He discusses the essentials of good government, city charters, different types of city government, the management of public schools and the cost of government. He aims to simplify the handling of the problems of the city by tracing the progress of each movement, by giving constructive analysis of the existing situation, and by pointing the general way to future progress. The book is of extreme interest to thousands of American men and women voters who are intensely interested in making the government of their cities effective and efficient. Fully illustrated with Graphs and Diagrams. $5.00

Send for a circular more fully describing this important book

Our Unconscious Mind and How to Use It

By FREDERICK PIERCE, Research Psychologist.

The explanation of a source of tremendous power, with specific applications to personal relationships, to the home, to training and educating children, to working life, to physical health and mental energy, to such business problems as better organization, advertising, selling and merchandising. $3.00

Here and Now Story Book

By LUCY SPRAGUE MITCHELL

"A gold mine of literature for young children . . . among the most genuine things that have ever been written." W. C. Ryan, Jr. $2.00

Health Education and the Nutrition Class

A Report of the Bureau of Educational Experiments; which Dr. Winslow, Professor of Public Health, Yale University, describes as "certainly one of the most helpful presentations of this important subject that we have yet had." $3.50

The Child and His School

By GERTRUDE HARTMAN

A source book of the findings of modern sciences (Biology, Psychology, Sociology) as to human nature and elementary education as a social process. $3.00

The Dalton Laboratory Plan

By EVELYN DEWEY

Describes a new type of education and the manner of its working out in three schools independently developing it. $2.00

Invention: The Master Key to Progress

By Rear-Admiral BRADLEY A. FISKE

A complete and most valuable running story of man's achievements, which bind together all progress in art, science, government, philosophy and even religion. An amazingly stimulating book. $4.00

Atomic Theories

By F. H. LORING

"The greater part of natural philosophy is the outcome of the structure and mechanism of the atom," says J. J. Thomson. $5.00

The Mystery of Mormonism

By STUART MARTIN

A clear, judicial history of Mormonism greatly needed, since existing accounts have been either so partisan or so hostile that few have a correct appreciation of the place in history of this strange sect. $7.50

Einstein the Searcher

By ALEXANDER MOSZKOWSKI

Explanations and interpretations derived through dialogues with Einstein. $5.00

The Influence of the Sea on the Political History of Japan

By Vice-Admiral G. A. BALLARD

A convenient review of the history of Japan, of her present strategic position and the future relationships of the Powers on the Pacific. $7.00

With the Russian Army 1914-'17

By Maj.-Gen. Sir ALFRED KNOX

Gen. Knox had the widest opportunity of observing the Russian forces before and during the war, and revolution. Most valuable of all reference books on this subject. 2 vols. $15.00

Lenin

By M.-A. LANDAU-ALDANOV

Perhaps the sanest, most impartial and most competent portrait of this curiously influential personality yet written. $3.00

A Prisoner of the Reds

By FRANCIS McCULLAGH

This thrilling narrative of the experiences of a British Intelligence Officer is the most absorbingly interesting record that has come out of Siberia. $5.00

Any bookstore can supply these books; or if not, they can be had from

E. P. DUTTON & CO., 681 Fifth Avenue, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to preserve conditions required to make intelligence a dominating force of the personality.

The great question before the world today is not the establishment of democracy, nor the settlement of the controversy between labor and capital; it is rather the question as to whether man possesses the intelligence to exercise a rational control over his own acts. There is sufficient knowledge already to make effective the practice of cooperation in the solution of social, national, and racial problems, but do we possess the ability to put this knowledge into practice? Much could be accomplished in removing obstacles that today make cooperation and arbitration difficult. Too much attention has been given to arguments, and little time devoted to the analysis and cultivation of the dispositions favorable for promoting mutual agreements either between individual citizens or nations. The entire civilized world is fagged. On all sides we see evidences of the loss of interest in concrete problems. The general irritability, and inability to concentrate attention for any length of time on one subject, the tendency to become suspicious, argumentative, and desirous of radical changes are symptoms that are induced by dissociation in the personality during this twentieth century stage of evolution. Preparatory to the establishment of law and order, and the adoption of more rational methods of thinking, it is necessary to recognize and treat these symptoms. . . .

We learn a great deal about Dr. Paton in the chapters of which this is the conclusion, and so, inferentially, about human behavior. But much in these chapters is impertinent intrusion of the writer's prejudices rather than the impartial presentation of the scientific evidence. And what is pertinent is turgid, redundant and confused. In fact, Dr. Paton has brought together the raw material for a prolegomena to the discussion of human behavior. If, now, he could organize it, and rewrite it as nearly as the material permits, in English, he would perform a needful and a welcome service.

H. M. KALLEN.

Mr. Benchley's Message to His Age

Of All Things! by Robert C. Benchley. New York: Henry Holt and Co. $1.75.

MR. BENCHLEY'S collected burlesques are, of course, exceedingly funny: they are a little like Stephen Leacock, but more urbane than Leacock. Mr. Benchley, if he has not the force of Mr. Leacock's violent and barbarous imagination, has not developed Mr. Leacock's vice of making five bad gags to one good one. He nearly always makes you laugh and he never makes you ill—which is high praise for an American humorist.

But it is not of Mr. Benchley's farces that I propose to speak in this review. Indeed, if he were only an Irvin Cobb, there would be no reason to review him at all. But there is a phase of Mr. Benchley—(and of the humorists of whom he is the leader)—which has a certain intellectual importance and which might have a great deal more. They are perhaps unconscious of it but it is nevertheless true that Mr. Benchley and his companions amount to something like an antidote to the patent medicines administered by the popular magazines. The great function which they perform is making Business look ridiculous. It is not enough that people should laugh at Mr. Addison Sims of Seattle: they must also learn to laugh, as Mr. Benchley teaches them to, at Window Card Psychology and the Woonsocket Wrought Iron Pipe—nor must they forget Mr. Joseph L. Gonnick and his Cantilever Bridges. Mr. Benchley's burlesques of Business and of the Business magazines are surely the most inspired things in his book and, it seems to me, the funniest; there is almost a note of savagery about them which he all too seldom lets us hear.

But why does Mr. Benchley stop here? Why isn't he more savage? Why does he cling so long to the pleasant nonsense of The Harvard Lampoon? We know that he can write first-rate satire from his sketch The Making of a Red. (Why has he omitted it from the book, by the way? It is perhaps the best thing he ever did.) Why does he never let his private indignations get into his humorous work? Does he hesitate for the same reason that he hesitates (according to one of his sketches) about giving the number of his floor to the elevator boy? What self-consciousness, what timidity has divorced his convictions from his jokes?

The truth is, I suppose, that if Mr. Benchley and his friends do not set out to écraser l'infâme, it is because they are not sufficiently detached from it. In spite of the fact that they make fun of it, they still identify themselves with it. In order to attack it effectively they would have to tear themselves up by the roots. What might happen if they did, we have already seen in Main Street. Mr. Lewis burst bellowing from the advertising agencies and the popular magazines and gave vent to a bitter caricature of the life he was saturated with.—But what is to prevent Mr. Benchley, at least, from doing something of this kind? He has not the creative energy nor the violent reaction of Mr. Lewis, but he has at least a gift of burlesque, a nose for the silly and the cheap and a passion against intolerance. It is precisely such ridicule as his which can destroy the tyranny of our gods and he can surely not plead at this date that there is not an audience for it. Let him turn from an outworn genre which should have passed away with Bill Nye and devote himself to the deflation of the gas-bags that crowd our world: the journalism, the commercial booming and the barbarous public opinion.

EDMUND WILSON, JR.

Contributors

LEO WOLMAN is the chief of the Research Department of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

PIERRE HAMP is a French social worker, and the author of a number of books into which he has put his first-hand knowledge of the life of a French laborer.

CHARLES ASHLEIGH, a young poet and journalist, born in England, was arrested as an I. W. W. in 1917 under the Espionage Act, tried at Chicago with the group of 106 I. W. W.'s, convicted, and sentenced to a term of ten years, of which he served two at Fort Leavenworth. President Harding at Christmas commuted his sentence to release conditional on his deportation. He was deported in February and is now in England.

CHARLES A. BEARD is the author of Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy.

LEWIS MUMFORD has been associate editor of the Dial and acting editor of the London Sociological Review.

HERBERT S. GORMAN is assistant editor of the New York Times Book Review.

H. M. KALLEN, author of William James and Henri Bergson; and the Old Zionism and the New, is on the staff of the New School of Social Research, New York City.

EDMUND WILSON, JR., has been on the editorial staff of the New Republic and of Vanity Fair.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED